

WEEKLY MAGAZINE OF CHURCH & CATHOLIC HISTORY.
CONTAINING A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,
A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND,
A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,
A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF WALES,
A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND,
A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,
A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF WALES,

THE

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

FEBRUARY, 1837.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ART. I.—*The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in the blessed Eucharist, proved from Scripture. In Eight Lectures, delivered in the English College, Rome. By NICHOLAS WISEMAN, D.D. Pp. xi. 277. London: Booker. 1836.*

(Concluded from p. 32.)

HAVING reviewed the first four Lectures contained in this volume, we pursue our investigation, and challenge attention to the latter moiety of Dr. Wiseman's labours, in the "second section," which purports to be an "Examination of the Words of the Institution."

We must assume the privilege of remarking, that an honest inquirer into the point at issue between Papists and Protestants, touching the doctrine of transubstantiation, would have made "the words of the institution" the very first object of his study, if not the exclusive theme, instead of wasting his time in long criticisms upon a topic which bears but a doubtful and disputed reference to the matter before him. Granting the reference contended for, we deny that it conduces at all to the establishment of transubstantiation; and therefore, the anxious pains wasted on this preliminary discussion is a work of mere supererogation. We would just ask, on the score of common sense, whether the nature of a religious rite can be so satisfactorily interpreted as by the very words of the institution? Where else can we find so sure a guide? "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." To these very words we confidently appeal: nor is less confidence claimed by Papists in their appeal to the same words.

Here (writes our author) is our argument: and what can we advance, to prove a strict accordance between our doctrine and that of our Saviour, stronger and clearer, than the bare enunciation of our dogma beside the words which he used in delivering it. "This is my body," says our Lord; "I believe it to be thy body," replies the Catholic. "This is my blood," repeats our

Redeemer; "I believe it to be the *figure* of thy blood," rejoins the Protestant. Whose speech is here *yea yea*? who saith *amen* to the teaching of Christ? Is it the Catholic or the Protestant? You must plainly see that we have nothing more or better to say for ourselves than what Christ has already said; and that our best argument consists in the bare repetition of his sacred and infallible words.—P. 161.

Thus we join issue with our adversaries; and our dispute is, not whether the words of the institution be properly adduced to show the nature of the rite, but whether they must have a literal or a tropical interpretation. This is the point to be demonstrated: and the figurative construction being disallowed, Dr. Wiseman's object, in his fifth Lecture, is the establishment of the literal sense.

The words of the institution of the blessed Eucharist, taken from Matt. xxvi. 26—28; Mark xiv. 22—24; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23—25; are carefully prefixed to the Lecture under review, according to the Greek text, the Vulgate, and our Protestant authorized version. Having made some observations upon the differences in these sacred narrations, Dr. Wiseman tells us that such "varieties do not affect the substance of the narrative." Perhaps not. But what of that? It would have been more to his purpose to show how they help the Roman hypothesis. If they have no such advantage, why parade them with theatrical trick for mere stage effect, in the preface to the Lecture before us? We would by no means object to scriptural evidence; nor are we blind to the differences observable in the respective writers who have described the history of the Eucharist. But we may be permitted to wonder much at their adduction by Dr. Wiseman, because they manifestly subserve the Protestant, rather than his views upon the case under discussion. If different expressions be made use of by sacred writers in their respective accounts of the institution of the Eucharist, and in the words said to be spoken by our Lord himself at that time, is it not palpable that the apostles and evangelists were not "superstitiously scrupulous in numbering his words," nor "solicitous to relate the very words, and those only," which he spake? Whilst some record fewer words, and some more, all seem to think it sufficient to represent exactly the intent of the whole rite. And these inconsiderable differences in expression will furnish us with an argument that the writers did not understand the words of the institution to relate to Christ's body and blood in a literal sense; for the whole tenor and form of the institution is in the figurative way of speech, and all the expressions in it ought to be understood in the same manner. "For instance, the cup, in the words recorded by St. Luke and St. Paul, is allowed not to signify the cup, but the wine in the cup. This wine is allowed by all not to be itself the new covenant, nor to be changed into the new covenant, but only to be the memorial of the new covenant. If, therefore, the cup, in the words of the institution, be not the cup,

but the wine in it,—if the wine in it be not itself the new covenant, though declared to be so as expressly as the bread is declared to be Christ's body, or the wine his blood,—it follows, by all the rules of interpretation, agreeably to the way of speaking throughout the whole, that the bread and wine are not the natural body and blood of Christ, but the memorials of his body and blood. To say the contrary is to affirm that the same manner of expression, in the same short institution of a religious rite, in one part of it must be interpreted figuratively, merely to avoid absurdities, and in another part of it, must be interpreted literally, notwithstanding the greatest heap of the same sort of absurdities.”* Henee, then, it is obvious that Dr. Wiseman’s formal parade of the differences observable in the sacred narratives which give us the history of the institution of the Eucharist, is of no avail to his hypothesis, but quite the reverse,—being in truth of manifest subserviency to the Protestant doctrine! But of this enough: turn we to the subject-matter of the Lecture under review. The “ribald scurrility” of Protestants, when speaking of the Eucharist,—justly reprobated by our author,—we would not for a moment defend: we would merely crave the privilege of confessing our ignorance of such vulgarities on the part of Protestant writers, and of hinting that, possibly, the harshness of papal imputations, whereby we are accused of being “at least ignorantly blasphemous,” may have given rise to these strong retorts, however they may fail to justify them! Let us hear Dr. Wiseman.

When I consider how very parallel to these and such like (contumelies) are the taunts formerly cast by Julian the Apostate, and his fellows, on the Galileans—the equivalent for Papists in ancient controversy—because they believed a mere man to be God, against the evidence of their senses, on his bare word that he *was* God, I own I feel not only comforted, but proud at finding ourselves placed in a situation so similar as our ancestors in Christianity, with relation to our modern adversaries.—P. 162.

Well said, Dr. Wiseman! We should like much to be taught, however, where Galileans are described to be equivalent to Papists, and where he has learnt that primitive Christians believed a mere man to be God, on his bare assertion, and against the evidence of their senses. Certainly, not in the Scriptures: they speak of Jesus of Nazareth as of “a man approved of God by miracles, and wonders, and signs;” and our blessed Redeemer himself has told us that his works bore witness of his divine mission,—adding emphatically, “If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.”† What now shall we say of our Lecturer’s proud self-gratulation? What now shall we think of belief in Christ’s “bare word,” “against the evidence of sense?”

* Bp. Hoadly’s “Plain Acct.” pp. 16, 17.

† John v. 31.

We beg leave to remind Dr. Wiseman,—he cannot, surely, need to be informed,—that we do not pin our faith upon the declamation of fashionable preachers, or the statements of popular writers, of whatever communion; and therefore, that we dismiss from our notice all that he has urged upon errors, (if they be errors,) selected from such sources, leaving their respective authors, Dr. Lee, Mr. Faber, Dr. A. Clarke, Mr. Hartwell Horne, Bishop Tomline, and the "select preachers at Tavistock-place Chapel," &c. &c. to vindicate themselves! Our appeal is to the Word of God, as interpreted by our Church, in her Articles, her Liturgy, and her Homilies; and we are "not careful" to inquire into, or to defend the opinions of individual preachers and writers, who claim no authoritative dominion over our creed, and with whose "defiance of the rules of logic and hermeneutics" we have no sympathy: our task is of a far different character. It is our province, in the review of Dr. Wiseman's Lectures, to expose his sophistries, and to reprobate his errors. It is our duty, in the prosecution of our office, to maintain the Protestant faith of our Church touching the Eucharist, inviolate by the rash hands of such heretical Lecturers as the one before us, and to instruct our readers how little the cause of truth is endangered by his cunning, his subtlety, and his pedantic craft!

We have already said that our author's design, in the fifth Lecture, is to examine the Protestant arguments, whereby it is wont to be contended that the words of the institution will bear a metaphorical interpretation. Accordingly, he quotes the following passages, as those relied upon to show the ground on which the figurative sense has been held by his opponents: and he distributes them into four classes, "because," he says, "the same answers do not apply exactly to all," and he hopes "to gain in clearness by the separation of such incongruous materials."

1st class.—1. Gen. xli. 26, 27, "The seven good kine **ARE** seven years." Dan. vii. 24, "The ten horns **ARE** ten kingdoms." Matt. xiii. 38, 39, "The field **is** the world; the good seed **is** the children of the kingdom; the tares **ARE** the children of the wicked one. The enemy **is** the devil; the harvest **is** the end of the world; the reapers **ARE** the angels." 1 Cor. x. 4, "And the rock **was** Christ." Gal. iv. 24, "For these **ARE** the two covenants." Apoc. i. 20, "The seven stars **are** the angels of the seven churches."

2. Jo. x. 7, "I **AM** the door;" xv. 1, "I **AM** the true vine."

3. Gen. xvii. 10, "This **is** my covenant between thee and me," speaking of circumcision.

4. Exod. xii. 11, "This **is** the Lord's Passover."—P. 169.

The point to be established, we would "remind our readers, is the figurative sense of the words used in the institution of the sacrament,—" This **is** my body;—" the question is simply, whether the verb "is" may be construed figuratively. These passages demonstrate the point; for therein we see the substantive verb tropically construed; "the rock **was**" not literally, but figuratively, and typically, and symbolically,

"Christ;" and so of the rest. Now, what says Dr. Wiseman, the accredited champion of Popery, the public lecturer in the English College at Rome? What answer does this learned Nuncio make to these passages, where the verb referred to is taken metaphorically?

On the other hand, I can bring them some thousands of passages, where the verb "to be" is taken literally (!!!)—P. 170.

Admirable indeed! Who can but laugh at such ridiculous logic? Really, really, this exceeds all power of gravity, and we must lay down our pen to enjoy a hearty laugh, "holding both our sides," at this truly Hibernian argument. Ha! ha! ha! It reminds us of the witty Irishman, who, in opposition to the testimony of twenty eye-witnesses of his assault upon a plaintiff, offered to produce forty who had not seen it! Can our author be serious? "*Naviget Anticyram!*" He affects gravely to argue the point, and would deny the force of these passages, because they have no parallelism with the words of the institution of the Eucharist. Those texts only are to be ranked as parallel, he contends, where a resemblance of things, and not merely one of words, can be pointed out.

Before, therefore, the Protestant can have a right to explain the words "this is my body," by "the field is the world," it is not sufficient for him to show me that the word *is* occurs in both, but that the same *thing* or object is intended.—P. 172.

Our author allows all the texts of the first class to be strictly parallel one with another. He then continues thus:—

To place this point beyond controversy, let us take an instance. If I desire to illustrate the phrase (Gen. xli. 26) "the seven good kine are seven years," by Matt. xiii. 38, "the field is the world," or both these by Gal. iv. 24, "For these are the two covenants," I am fully justified in doing so, and in considering the passages as perfectly parallel; because the context in all three demonstrates to me that the same *thing* exists in all; namely, the *explanation of a symbolical instruction*, in one instance a vision, in another a parable, in the third an allegory. But then it follows likewise, that in order to thrust the words "this is my body" into the same category, and treat them as parallel, we must show *them* also to contain the same *thing* (which every single instance in the first class of texts does show)—the explanation of a symbolical instruction. Till this be done, there is no parallelism established.—Pp. 174, 175.

We would confidently ask,—allowing, for the sake of argument, the correctness of Dr. Wiseman's rule and inference,—whether, even according to his own showing, the words "this is my body" and "the field is the world," be not accurately parallel, for that the same *thing* may be predicated of both phrases, the first being an explanation of a symbolical rite,—the second being an explanation of a symbolical parable? But we deny our author's doctrine. His rule we demur to, and his inference we repudiate. The rule is "that the same **THING** must be found in the texts, for us to be justified in considering them parallel." Does our author mean that the signification of words must be determined thus? Does he seriously mean to tell us that a Lexico-

grapher would confine himself to passages where the same things were spoken of, to determine the signification of a word? Absurd! Would that we possessed the scourge of Johnson to whip these pedants for their follies, their vanity, and their affectation! Does our author mean to teach us that words cannot be interpreted by synonymous words? that comparison of the uses of words is not a legitimate method of ascertaining their sense? We refer him to Watts,* who counsels us, when in quest of an author's meaning, to "compare THE WORDS and phrases in one place with the same in another place, which are generally called PARALLEL places." But then, it should seem, according to our author, that this Protestant argument from the figurative sense of the verb "to be" may be triumphantly retorted against us in the mouth of a Socinian, who has an equal right to interpret the phrase "the Word WAS God" by the parallelism "the rock WAS Christ," and to explain it by "the Word REPRESENTED God." "Whatever Protestants, in this point, deny to Socinians, they grant to Papists; and whatever they take from Papists, they give in argument to the Socinian;" i. e.—(for such is Dr. Wiseman's argument)—because the verb "to be" may, and does in some cases, require a tropical interpretation, it must and shall have a tropical sense in all cases! Profound logic! Accurate argumentation!—Is it for Dr. Wiseman to talk about "the philosophy of language," and "logical consistency of ideas?" Yet, we suppose, we must hear him. He writes thus:—

According to the philosophy of language, there are two ways of considering these sentences, both of which save the logical consistency of the idea, and yet preserve to the verb substantive its true determinate meaning. The first is, to consider one of the objects mentioned, or the predicate, in the form of an adjective or epithet: that is, as the concrete expression of the qualities which belong to the other. As though one should say, "the rock was Christlike," the name Christ being the complete enunciation of the qualities meant to be attributed to the rock. And in this manner of conception, the verb "to be" keeps its own determinate signification expressive of identity. A second way of analysing these passages is to consider the subject as specifically modified by the circumstances of the occasion, so as to be deprived of that material quality which defies identity with another object. In other words "the rock" means not the material rock, but as St. Paul himself describes it, "the spiritual rock which followed them;" that is, an ideal rock which was symbolized in the material one, and which was truly Christ. Here again "to be" has its genuine power, and expresses identity; the substitution of the idea or phrase "represents," is an act of our limited minds, unable to grasp the pure ideal expression.—Pp. 179, 180.

Now, we venture to submit that our author's argument, if we comprehend it aright, rests upon the untenable hypothesis that similarity is identity; how else can the verb "to be," in the phrase "the rock was Christ," be said to "keep its own determinate signification expressive of identity?" Oh! but there was a spiritual, *i. e.* an ideal rock, which

* Watts quoted by Johnson under v. Parallel.

was symbolized in the material one, and which was truly Christ! and, therefore, "to be has its genuine power, and expresses identity." Who ever heard of an ideal rock? How could this ideal rock be symbolized under a material one? Then, again,—how could the Israelites actually drink of an ideal rock? Did they not in point of fact drink of the material rock which was miraculously smitten by Moses? If so, (and such in truth was the case,)—was not that material rock the very rock of which St. Paul says, "that rock was Christ?"—Let us hear Dr. Wiseman again.

Christ does not say "bread is my body," "wine is my blood," which in point of construction, would have brought these words within a possibility of a comparison with "the seven kine are seven years," or, "the horns are kings." But, he says, "this is my body," "this is my blood." The THIS is nothing but the body and the blood; it represents nothing, it means nothing, till identified, at the close of the sentence, with the substances named.

This is even more marked in the original Greek than in our language; because the distinction of genders shows clearly that the bread is not indicated; but only a vague something, to be determined by the remainder of the sentence. In this manner, the motive or reason which in those texts drives us from the literal sense, as involving a contradiction, does not exist here, and consequently we cannot consider this as parallel with them.—Pp. 180, 181.

Thus does our Lecturer relieve the labour of polemical warfare, "interspersing with verdure and with flowers the dusty deserts of barren philology."* What he lacks in strength of argument, he gains in confidence of dogmatical assertion: "the THIS is nothing, but the body and the blood; it represents nothing, it means nothing, till identified, at the close of the sentence, with the substances named." "The distinction of genders shows clearly that the bread is not indicated." Is it come to this? Do we see this Papal Lecturer from Rome itself, leaving the infallible authority of his Church and of tradition, and basing the interpretation of Scripture upon human learning, and grammatical niceties, and verbal disquisitions? "How are the mighty fallen!" But,—a truce to ejaculatory queries:—let us try the worth of our author's criticisms. "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ Σῶμά μου." The word "τοῦτο," says Dr. Wiseman, being of the neuter gender, cannot agree with *ἄρτος*, understood. Granted. "It must, therefore, agree with *σῶμα*." This we deny; and we would just hint to our grammatical Lecturer, that it may, possibly, agree with *χρήμα*, understood; or, perhaps, with *βρῶμα*; or, peradventure, with *κλάσμα*, frustum panis,—viz. the piece which our Saviour then held in his hands, and which he had just broken, previously to its consecration.† We have not time to search for examples, nor room to insert them in our fugitive pages. We cannot forget, however, that the sacred writers sometimes seem to use *τοῦτο* in the neuter gender, when grammatical accuracy would have

* Preface to Johnson's Dictionary, 4to. edit. p. 7.

† Compare Matt. xiv. 19, 20, with Mark xiv. 22, 24.

demanded a different form. Perhaps, (for we by no means speak confidently,) Eph. ii. 8 may illustrate our position, though we are aware that learned commentators have given another construction to these words: “τῷ γὰρ χάριτι ἐστε σεωσμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν· Θεοῦ τὸ ἔστορον οὐκ ἐξ ἑργῶν.” But we quit this topic for higher points; only we would remark upon the strange inconsistency of Papists, who would set aside the figurative sense of the words of the institution of the Eucharist, and yet understand bread metaphorically in John vi. 48 and 51!

Our author, in order to invalidate the testimony of John x. 7, and xv. 1, adduces five reasons, as he terms them, to prove that these passages can boast of no parallelism with the words of the eucharistic institution. They seem to rest pretty much upon the dictum that “a declaration of similarity does not constitute a type, or commemorative symbol; and that we must not presume to ground the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper on nothing more than similarity.” To be sure;—the perpetual obligation of the rite upon all Christians depends upon something more substantial than philological inferences,—even upon the preceptive words of our Lord, which make it our bounden duty to partake of the holy symbols of his body and blood,—“Do THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME.” Our readers will at once perceive, therefore, that “the positive institution” of the Eucharist has no connexion with the matter under discussion, however Dr. Wiseman may endeavour to join them together. For whether the verb “to be” admit of his or of our interpretation,—whether it signify to “resemble” and to “symbolize,” and to “represent,” or keep its own determinate literal substantive sense,—whatever be the meaning of this verb, the perpetual obligation of the rite remains precisely the same. Dr. Wiseman tells us that “a declaration of similarity does not constitute a type, or commemorative symbol.” Does he mean that “a type” and “a commemorative symbol” are synonymous? But, let us allow his dictum:—are we thence to conclude anything as to the sense of the words, “This is my body?” The point at issue is the signification of the substantive verb in that form. MAY it bear any other sense than the literal one?—that is the question. Papists reply, “No.” Protestants answer, “Yes.” To prove their case, they adduce many passages in which the literal sense of the verb is inadmissible. What is inadmissible in such passages may be inadmissible here. Q. E. D.! They claim to have demonstrated their hypothesis; they challenge the palm of victory for having thus shown that the words of institution can be understood figuratively without doing violence to their construction, and in harmony with similar forms of expression found in Scripture. Our author denies the parallelism of the passages adduced, either because in them the verb in question is to be taken literally, or else because the circumstances in which

they occur, are such as group them into a class apart, into which the words of the institution cannot possibly be forced ! We protest, in all sincerity, that we have not been able to discover the least efficacy in any one of the points so strenuously put by our Lecturer. It is quite beyond our province, as Reviewers, to enter into a minute refutation of his statements one by one.—To illustrate the general character of a work, it is sufficient that we bring forward its leading points, and thus give our readers an opportunity of forming a judgment of its merits ; else, every article would become a treatise, and every treatise swell into a volume. Long, however, as we have dwelt upon the fifth Lecture of Dr. Wiseman, and much as we have trespassed upon the patience of our readers, we must refer to another point, to which a singular importance seems to be attached, in the pages before us.

We come finally (says our author) to the passage occupying the fourth class, which possesses an interest quite independent of its real value. "This is the Lord's passover."—Pp. 188.

We are informed by Dr. Wiseman (the passage is too long for insertion here,) how Zwinglius claimed to have been favoured with the discovery of this text by God in a dream. He then comments on the history in the following terms of bitter indignation :—

There is much to remark in this statement. One does not know, after reading it, whether to consider the writer a mad enthusiast, or little better than an idiot. It is scarcely possible to understand the motives which impelled him to publish this disgraceful narrative, in spite of his own better feelings. The best criterion for ascertaining whether the spirit, if any, who suggested this palmary argument against us was a true or a lying one, is to see whether the argument he suggested was correct or false ; and if we find that the text is nothing on earth to the purpose, I think we may determine the character of its suggestor ; if, indeed, the incoherences of a raver deserve such credit.—Pp. 189, 190.

It moves our laughter to witness the holy vituperation thus poured from Papal vials upon the pate of Protestants ! Did our Lecturer never hear of dreamers in the pale of his own Church ? Does he forget one Juliana, who lived at Liege ? We beg leave to refresh his memory, in the words of Mosheim, who is discoursing upon the natural consequences of "the monstrous doctrine of Transubstantiation."

"That which gave the finishing touch to this heap of absurdities, was the institution of the celebrated annual 'festival of the holy Sacrament,' or, as it is sometimes called, of 'the Body of Christ': the origin of which was as follows :—A certain devout woman, whose name was Juliana, declared that she had received a revelation from heaven, intimating to her that it was the will of God that a peculiar festival should be annually observed in honour of the holy Sacrament, or rather of the real presence of Christ's body in that institution. Few gave credit to this pretended vision, whose circumstances were extremely absurd, and which would have come to nothing had it not been

supported by Robert, Bishop of Liege, who, in the year 1246, published an order for the celebration of this festival, notwithstanding the opposition which he knew would be made to a proposal founded only on an idle dream.”*

The pretensions of this fanatical woman were subsequently supported by Pope Urban IV., and, in 1311, by Clement V.

“Who thus, in spite of all opposition, established a festival,† which contributed more to render the doctrine of Transubstantiation agreeable to the people, than the decree of the Lateran Council under Innocent III., or than all the exhortations of his lordly successors.”‡

So much for Dr. Wiseman’s assumed wrath at the “disgraceful narrative” of Zwinglius! Is it more disgraceful than Juliana’s “idle dream,” thus disgracefully supported by Councils and by Popes? Were these Popes “mad enthusiasts,” or “little better than idiots?” We entreat our compassionate author to bestow at least a portion of his pity on the credulous dupes who were thus cheated into a reception of the dogma of Transubstantiation, and not to spend it all upon “the poor burghers of Zurich, who allowed themselves to be cheated out of their belief in the Catholic dogma.” One word more on this everlasting topic, and we have done. Dr. Wiseman, to get rid of Exod. xii. 11, though half inclined to favour Dr. Trever’s interpretation, by referring the word “this” to the day or festival, makes the pronoun refer to the repast or sacrifice, paraphrasing the passage in this manner,—“this is the paschal feast sacred to the Lord.”

This rendering is placed beyond all controversy by a passage perfectly parallel, in the very chapter from which the objection is drawn, which if Zwinglius had possessed the sagacity to compare, he would not have become the instrument of ensnaring his unlearned auditors. I allude to the twenty-seventh verse, in which we read of this very sacrifice as follows, הוּא לְחִיה זֶבַח-פָּסָח Here the paschal feast is spoken of not as any emblem of the Lord’s passover, but as its sacrifice; and the thing so spoken of is said *to be* sacred to the Lord. The verb which expresses this idea must necessarily be taken in its own strict sense, for it affirms the fact of this consecration. In the other passage, therefore, in which the same thing is spoken of, and the same construction employed, we must conclude that the word has the same meaning;¶ “this is the paschal feast sacred to the Lord.”—Pp. 192, 193.

May we borrow the weapons of our antagonist for a moment? May we not reply to his statement in his own phrase, “our best argument consists in the bare repetition of the words?” “This is the Lord’s

* Mosheim, Cent. 13. Pt. II. c. 4. and 2. 4to. ed. vol. iii. p. 261.

† It is sometimes called, “Fête de Dieu.”

‡ Mosheim, Cent. 13. 4to. ed. vol. iii. p. 263.

¶ Rosenmüller, “Scholia in loc.” Of course when we speak of the verb substantive in these texts, it is of the verb understood and not expressed; as in Hebrew it is not used simply to connect two terms in a sentence. The argument, however, is precisely the same.

passover," says Moses. "I believe it to be the Lord's Passover," replies the Protestant. "This is the Lord's Passover," says Moses; "I believe it to be the sacrifice of the Passover," rejoins the Papist! "Whose speech is here yea, yea? Who saith, Amen, to the teaching of Moses? Is it the Papist or the Protestant?"—But, seriously, when Dr. Wiseman presumes to assert that the pascha is not an emblem of the Lord's passover, but its sacrifice, does he forget the narrative of the inspired legislator at Exodus xiii. 3—10?—"And thou shalt show thy son in that day, saying, 'This is done because of that which the Lord did unto me, when I came forth out of Egypt. And it shall be a sign unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes.—Thou shalt therefore keep this ordinance in his season from year to year.'"^{*} We could add much more, but our limits summon us to Lecture the Sixth, which proposes the question—"Whether such difficulties surround the literal meaning of the words of the institution, as drive us, however unwilling, to take refuge in a metaphor?" The Doctor opens his discourse with a convenient "if."

If the words spoken by our Saviour be such as admit of no other meaning but what we attribute to them, it follows that this meaning alone, with all its difficulties, must be received, or else belief in Christ's omnipotence, or in his veracity, be renounced; an idea too blasphemous to be ever entertained.—Pp. 195, 196.

But this hypothetical phraseology is soon exchanged for positive dogma, thus:—

Having proved that in the language used by our Saviour he can only have had one meaning, we have a right to propose a similar dilemma. We cannot depart from that meaning, but can only choose between believing or disbelieving him. If you say, that what he asserts involves an impossibility, the only choice is, will you believe what he states, in spite of its teaching what *to you* seems such, or will you reject his word and authority for it? It cannot be, that he does not state it, when all the evidence which can possibly be required or desired proves that he did. In a word, Christ says, "this is my body," and every rule of sound interpretation tells you that he must have meant to say it simply and literally: your selection is between belief or disbelief that it is his body; but you are shut out from all attempts to prove that he could not mean to make that literal assertion.—Pp. 196, 197.

To this *petitio principii* we say nothing. It deserves no answer. The attack upon Faber we leave to the able pen of Faber himself. We would rather employ our cogitations for awhile upon our author's hermeneutical disquisition, and philosophical principles.

The institution of the Eucharist was addressed primarily to the twelve who were present. To satisfy ourselves, therefore, how far the contradictions or apparent impossibilities, or violation of unalterable laws, involved in our interpretation, can have been the criterion used by them for reaching the sense of Christ's words, and how far he could have intended or expected them to use it, is now a question of great importance.—P. 204.

The physical difficulties supposed to be incurred by the papal inter-

* Burnet on the Articles, Art. 27.

pretation, afford no ground for rejecting or adopting it, in Dr. Wiseman's opinion; because the Apostles, to whom the words of the eucharistic institution were addressed, were illiterate men, accustomed to see their Master work miracles, and taught by him never to limit their confidence in his power. Having such unlimited notions of his almighty-ness, they would not question his power to transubstantiate the elements of bread and wine into his body and blood. The consequence is ob-vious; "they CANNOT have made the possibility or impossibility of the doctrine expressed, a criterion for interpreting our Saviour's words."

To this statement suffice it to answer, that this beautiful hypothesis happens to contradict the plain fact, as handed down to us in Holy Writ:—"The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying, How CAN this man give us his flesh to eat?"* We leave Dr. Wiseman to reconcile this fact with his hypothesis, as best he may: "non nos-trum est tantas componere lites."

Dr. Wiseman asks, with a confident air of triumph, "What are the laws of nature, which our interpretation is said to contradict?" and he answers his query himself: "All the pretended laws of nature, which it is said to transgress, are no more than results deducible from observa-tion; no one will venture to assert they have their being in the essence of matter."—P. 216.

When divines run into the labyrinth of such perplexities as these, we confess, with Hooker, that we possess not the leisure, perhaps not the wit nor capacity to tread out so endless mazes as the intricate disputes of this cause have led men into.† There is an infinite contra-diction between Papal opinions on the Sacrament and the true principles of Reason grounded upon Experience, Nature, and Sense. "Which albeit with boisterous courage and breath they seem often times to blow away, yet whoso observeth how again they labour and sweat by subtily of wit to make some show of agreement between their peculiar conceits and the general edicts of nature, must needs perceive they struggle with that which they cannot fully master."† This is indeed the case of Dr. Wiseman. To bolster up the absurd tenet of Transubstantiation, he is obliged, like all Papal writers, to have recourse to a new model of philosophy, new theories of substances and accidents; of matter, and ubication, and impenetrability. He would make us believe that the laws of nature belong not to "the essence of matter." Does he know, can he tell us, any thing about "the essence of matter?" Suppose his postulate to be conceded, is Transubstantia-tion a whit more scriptural? Be it, that the laws of nature are but "results deducible from observation;" what then? Does it follow

* John vi. 52.—"πάσι δύναμαι," &c.

† Hooker's Eccl. Pol. b. v. § 67.

that the bread of the Sacrament is flesh? Why, again, does Dr. Wiseman speak of "the qualities attributed to Christ's body risen from the dead?" (P. 214.) The sacramental elements symbolized his body broken, and his blood shed; and the words of consecration were spoken before our Lord's body was glorified;* if, therefore, they were literally intended, they can be interpreted of his body only in its former state; so that the qualities of his risen flesh have not the slightest connexion with Transubstantiation, however they may have possessed a power over the received laws of nature. For, what though our risen Lord "passed through closed doors," and "penetrated the stone vault of the sepulchre!" Does it follow, that the bread of the Eucharist is changed into the substance of Christ's body? Because Christ's glorified person penetrated closed doors, therefore the sacramental bread is changed into his flesh!!! Need we add any comment upon such logic? Oh, but, Transubstantiation is a miracle;—miracles are confessed deviations from the laws of Nature; and, therefore, our sacramental doctrine cannot be tried by "its accordance with the results deduced from the observation of nature's undeviating workings." (P. 215.) To this we reply, that a miracle is an appeal to our senses, and must be evident to sense; whereas the supposed change of the bread into the body of our Redeemer is contrary to what we see and taste, and touch and smell; and that "Transubstantiation is such a miracle as any man may work that hath but the confidence to face men down that he works it, and the fortune to be believed."† In good truth, the only thing miraculous about the doctrine of Transubstantiation is the impudence of its inventors, and the credulousness of its believers! Dr. Wiseman has not omitted to adduce the instance of our Saviour's conversion of water into wine,—"one substance into another."

It would require (he says) a very fine edge of intellect to distinguish in mind between the possibility of making water become wine, and the impossibility of making wine become blood.—P. 206.

Now, to this wretched sophistry it is obvious to answer, that we do not doubt what Christ CAN do, but what Papists SAY he has done; and that, after the change of the water into wine, in the case cited, the element no longer appeared to be water! How conveniently our author forgets his boasted doctrine of Parallelism!

Again: Dr. Wiseman is pleased to argue that the thing broken and given at the Eucharist could not be bread, "because the expression 'FOR YOU'‡ could not be used of it, but only of Christ, who was alone our redemption."

The force of this argument, (so to prostitute force and argument!)

* CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCE, Oct. 1836, p. 589.

† Tillotson's Sermons.

‡ "Τὸ μέρην διδόμενον."—Luke xxii. 19.

rests upon the assumption, that we may not figuratively predicate of an emblem what strictly belongs to the antitype. But of this fond assumption let it suffice shortly to say, that our author neither has nor can prove any such thing!

If our readers have impatiently waded through this sea of fallacies, their joy at reaching the Seventh of Dr. Wiseman's Lectures will be equal to the satisfaction of his Reviewers at the approaching termination of their critique. "Optatā potiuntur Troes arenâ."

In this Lecture our author treats of the objections made by Protestants to the Papal interpretation of the words of the eucharistic institution. There is little here but what has been already stated by him in the former part of his volume. Dr. Wiseman complains, in no bland temper, of the gross misrepresentations of his antagonists, Dr. A. Clarke, Dr. Lee, and Mr. Hartwell Horne,—with regard to his philological strictures upon the eucharistic formulae, in his *Essay upon the Syriac language*.* Sibi habeant lites:—they affect not the point at issue, and we must forbear to encumber our discussion with foreign considerations.

Once more, to the question before us. Looking to the words of the institution, Protestants argue that nothing is more common than to call a figure by the name of the object; as when we say of a picture, "This is Plato," or of a map, "This is Europe." To confute this reasoning as applicable to the Eucharist, Dr. Wiseman urges the obvious difference between these instances and the case to be elucidated, for that they speak of images already instituted, the other of the actual institution; and that whilst portraits and maps, &c. have no possible existence, except as representations, such is not the case with bread, in relation to the body of Christ.

Had bread and wine been before constituted symbols, the words might have been compared with a representation already made; then the phrase "this is my body" might possibly have led the hearers to a right understanding. But surely it is a very different thing to institute the symbol by such an expression.—P. 226.

Does our author forget the elaborate and zealous argument, so industriously pursued into its minutest details, and so patiently urged by him, to prove that John vi. related to the Eucharist? If THAT point be established,—was not bread THEN made a symbol of Christ's flesh? "I am the true Bread;"—"My flesh is meat indeed." The words of the eucharistic institution may well be explained by this text in St. John, and "this is my body," (not "might possibly.") but certainly would, have led the hearers to a right and figurative understanding!

Our pages warn us to conclude. Come we, therefore, to the Third

* The title of the *Essay* is this:—"De Objectionibus contra sensum literalem locorum Mat. xxvi. 26, &c. seu verborum SS. Eucharistiae Sacramentum Institutum, ex indole lingue Syriaca nuperrime instauratis, commentatio philologica, continens specimen supplementi ad Lexica Syriaca." Horne Syriaca, Rome, 1828.

Section, and Eighth Lecture of the volume under review. It is a discussion of "the Doctrine of St. Paul regarding the Eucharist," as developed in 1 Cor. x. 16, and xi. 27—29,—of which passages it is of course asserted, that they afford "a convincing argument" to the Papal doctrine. Dr. Wiseman acknowledges that the force of the former of these texts "is not so great as that of the second passage;" and therefore he dismisses it with a very brief and superficial glance. We, too, would follow his example, and confine our remarks to 1 Cor. xi. 27—29.—In these verses of St. Paul we read, that, whosoever receives the Eucharist unworthily, "is guilty of his body and blood." The Greek term for guilty is "*προχειρός*." Now, what is the meaning of this phrase? Dr. Wiseman says, that "to be guilty of Christ's body and blood" signifies "committing an injury against those component parts of his sacred person." But why so? Because, we are told, that an offence against Christ's person is "the highest outrage that can even be imagined;*" and therefore the disrespectful approach to a morsel of bread symbolical of him, "could not be designated by a name positively describing it!" This is very obscure, surely; but, as far as we understand the argument, we are free to avow its utter weakness. In the first place, it is founded upon the baseless assumption, that the offence spoken of is committed against "the component parts" of Christ's body, i. e. his flesh and blood. We maintain that the sin is committed against their symbols, here figuratively called his body and blood. In the second place, we hold, that irreverence towards those symbols argues an indecent mind, and renders us obnoxious to Divine wrath, and is indeed an "unworthy" participation of the sacramental feast, casting reproach, through the despised types, upon the antitype himself; in the same manner as he who "shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by Him that dwelleth therein;" or, as "he that shall swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by Him that sitteth thereon." (Matt. xxiii. 21, 22.) Yea, every Christian who eats and drinks "unworthily," in a manner unsuitable to the design of the institution, against the rules of decency and temperance, "not discerning the Lord's body," i. e. not considering the bread as the memorial of his body, but devours it greedily, and conducts himself with hungry rudeness,—"every such professing Christian is guilty of a high offence against the very body and blood of Christ, of which this bread and this wine are memorials; and which he pretends and professes to remember by this eating and drinking."[†] This is a fair paraphrase of St. Paul's text—1 Cor. xi. 27. If the defacing royal coin be a treasonable offence against the king, surely irreverence towards the symbols of Christ's person may be

* Is this consistent with Matt. xii. 31, 32?

[†] Hoadly's Plain Account, p. 64.

charged as a crime against his body and blood ; and yet, Transubstantiation be just as absurd, and as unscriptural as ever.

We have thus at length given, we hope, a pretty faithful epitome of these Lectures on the Corporal Presence. We have omitted, we think, no material point of Dr. Wiseman's volume, as far as the nature of our critical office demanded, and the limits of our review permitted. It is, we are bold to declare, a tissue of casuistical subtleties, which it requires no casuistry to refute ; and a specimen of perverted ingenuity, which sometimes provokes a smile, and sometimes challenges our indignation, though altogether without power to make us hesitate an instant as to the invulnerable truth of the Protestant doctrine of the blessed Eucharist. The absolute impossibility, the infinite scandal, the monstrous absurdity, the impious ferocity of the great burning article of Popery,—fit only for knaves to fabricate, for fools to believe, and for cannibals to adopt,—still appal us, and we, instinctively almost, repudiate the creed, and refuse all approach to communion with a church in which such "damnable" errors are held and defended ! We shall never cease to protest against a doctrine thus "by the mere will and tyranny of men imposed upon the belief of Christians without any evidence of Scripture, and against all evidence of sense and reason."* If the hocus-pocus of Transubstantiation gain no better advocate than the author before us, the defence of Protestantism will be an easy task. If Dr. Wiseman have said the best that can be said in maintenance of this dogma, the "strength" of the Vatican is to "sit still," in hope that the dignity of silence may be taken for the conviction of truth ! Mere dint of impudence may for awhile compel society to tolerate the strumpet's contaminating presence, so long as she forbears to expose her nakedness ; but when she dares to unveil her features, and proceeds to defend her immorality with ribald tongue and in flaunting attitude, the hue-and-cry of virtuous indignation hunts her from the pale of honourable men to congenial scenes of debauchery and darkness. So is it with Popery ! Could she blot the sun from heaven, or seal for ever the oracles of God ;—could she recall the dark ages, when she first beguiled ignorant mortals ;—could she roll back the tide of knowledge which is spreading over the face of the earth ;—her tricks might again escape detection, her creed might again be swallowed with Hottentot appetite, and Transubstantiation again count her infatuated dupes ! When, on the other hand, she comes forth into open day,—quits the cloisters of Rome, and leaves the sanctuary of the Pope,—to advocate her pretensions at the bar of public reason in the hearing of enlightened scholars, the verdict awaiting her we cannot permit ourselves to doubt. So long as men have the use of their

* Tillotson's Sermons.

senses, they will see bread to be bread, and taste wine to be wine, let the Church of Rome say what she may ! What right has any human being to set aside this judgment of the senses ? Tried at that tribunal, Transubstantiation is a villainous mockery, which we deride with contempt ; our only wonder being, how even children could be so far imposed upon as to listen to its history with faith !

In the peroration of his Lectures, Dr. Wiseman is pleased to say that Papists—

Construct [their] argument in each case from all the parts of the discourse, considered in relation with the historical circumstances, the philology of the language used, the character of our Saviour, his customary method of teaching, and every other subsidiary means of arriving at a true meaning. They, on the contrary, fasten upon some little phrase, in some corner of the narrative, which seems to favour their idea, or hunt out some other passage of Scripture somewhat resembling the words under examination ; and, overlooking all the mass of accumulative evidence which we possess, maintain that it must all give way before the hint which that favourite little text affords, or be interpreted by that imaginary parallelism. Thus, it is in vain that we urge the repeated injunctions of Christ to eat his flesh and drink his blood, and to receive him, and the manner in which he behaved to his disciples at Capernaum. All this is nothing, because he said at the end, and too late evidently to prevent the defection of his disciples, "the flesh profiteth nothing !" And yet these words, as has been fully shown, are nothing at all to the purpose of explanation. Again, nothing can be clearer than the words of institution considered with all their circumstances ; every thing tells with us ; but St. Paul, interpreting an allegory, said "the rock was Christ;" therefore Christ, when *not* interpreting an allegory, *must* be understood to mean "this represents my body!"—Pp. 268, 269.

We have never seen a grosser misrepresentation than this. The very reverse is the truth : "all the parts," indeed ! Yes ; but they apply figurative and literal construction to different portions of the very same eucharistic formulæ ; and, neglecting the whole genius and spirit of Christianity, and the evidence of Scripture and sense, doggedly insist upon the words of the institution, misconstrued and misapplied ! Is it for such men to boast of their ingenuousness ? Will it be believed that Dr. Wiseman, pretending to meet all Protestant objections, has said almost nothing upon the main objection urged by us against Transubstantiation,—its opposition to the legitimate testimony of our senses ? Yet, so it is ! And thus we leave him. We will but add, in the language of a learned ornament of our Church, upon another kindred doctrine, illusive and mischievous as the one before us,— "Whatever purpose was intended to be served by such a tenet, surely its real consequences must be detrimental to the cause of Christianity. If all about us is mere mockery and illusion, the very foundations of all evidence, all faith, and all practice, are undermined ; nor will it be possible to determine which position most contradicts my senses, or offers most violence to my conceptions, that which avers the non-existence of matter, or that which maintains the transubstantiation of it in the holy Sacrament."*

* Hawkins's Baint. Lect. Annot. p. 284.

ART. II.—Geology and Mineralogy considered with reference to Natural Theology. By the REV. WILLIAM BUCKLAND, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Reader in Geology and Mineralogy in the University of Oxford. London : Pickering. 1836. Pp. xvi. 599 ; viii. 128 ; plates 83.

(Continued from page 15.)

AMONGST other *Christians* who have supposed that long periods of time may be meant by day, *etc.*, is Augustine : they, therefore, who say, that such periods contradict the Bible record, question not only the orthodoxy of geologists, but of the primitive fathers ; and we need not say, in a doubt of the kind, the opinion of St. Augustine is of as much weight as that of a newspaper editor. But allowing such long periods to have occupied those primitive days, the arguments employed are as much available against this theory as against the former, and may be in the same way disposed of. Dr. Buckland's opinion is quoted above, (from 17—19 pages of vol. i.), and appears to throw a geological doubt upon the interpretation of *periods* for days ; for, as he truly says, no evidence has yet been geologically inferred as to the precedence of *vegetables* in the formations of the earth's crust. This argument is so conclusive, that we must, for the present, not repose upon the idea of days of ages. The discoveries made render it too problematical to be allowed without hesitation.* The question, then, to be resolved is, whether, seeing that the Bible record allows the *possibility*, geological researches require us to admit the *probability* of a period before the six days of Genesis for the changes which have certainly, at some distinct intervals, taken place in the surface of the globe, as it evidently must have existed, at different times, under the influence of modifying second causes. Now these have left traces of effects so clearly expli-

* Perhaps this requires a little explanation. It may suffice to say, that some scripture geologists have attempted to prove the correctness of the Mosaic narrative by a process of this sort. Vegetables, say they, were created on the *third* day ; animals not till the *fifth* and *sixth* days ; and this account agrees with the geological fact, that the fossil vegetables of the coal-measures occupy a lower position in the formation of the earth's crust than fossilized remains of animals ; whence, since the ferns, &c. of the coal-measures are plants that must have occupied a tropical moist country, and the primitive condition of the earth was hot and moist ; THEREFORE the plants of the coal-measures are the vegetation of the *third day* of Moses. Now, to say nothing of the botanical or other physical arguments against this hypothesis, recent discoveries have shown, that not only do *animal* remains occur *contemporaneously* with the vegetable remains in the coal-measures, but that animal remains actually occupy a *much lower geological site* than the coal itself ; not to take into account even the myriads of myriads of molluscous and other creatures of low organization, which occur in, and actually compose the limestone which underlies the coal. If, then, the days be periods of years, that hypothesis can gain no strength from the argument about vegetables in the coal, as created on the third day, or during the third epoch.

cable by phenomena that appear to have been the continued processes of powers originally impressed as laws upon the universe, as to make it a matter of actual necessity to have recourse to some such method of reconciling the difficulties of the case ; and this Dr. Buckland has suggested, with the full concurrence not only of contemporary geologists, but of contemporary and ancient divines, of whose aim and intentions there has never yet been a question or surmise. The names of Augustine, Theodoret, Theophilus, and others of the fathers ; of Petavius, Episcopius, Luther, Gleig, Burnet, Horsley,* Sumner, Chalmers, &c. &c., of various ages and churches in modern times, ought to be some guarantee, that men may, as geologists, entertain views different from their brethren who do not understand what geology actually reveals, and yet be as staunch defenders of the word of God as their opponents ; at the same time, that they are more likely to illustrate certain of its obscurities and mysterious assertions than those opponents. At any rate, the person who could read Dr. Buckland's book, and then talk of "rolling the road smooth for the march of atheism," in allusion to geology, must be devoid of common sense as well as truth and honesty : we really believe, he never read the book at all.

It may seem just matter of surprise, that many learned and religious men should regard with jealousy and suspicion the study of any natural phenomena, which abound with proofs of some of the highest attributes of the Deity ; and should receive with distrust, or total incredulity, the announcement of conclusions, which the geologist deduces from careful and patient investigation of the facts which it is his province to explore. These doubts and difficulties result from the disclosures made by geology, respecting the lapse of very long periods of time, before the creation of man. Minds which have been long accustomed to date the origin of the universe, as well as that of the human race, from an era of about six thousand years ago, receive reluctantly any information, which if true, demands some new modification of their present ideas of cosmogony : and, as in this respect, geology has shared the fate of other infant sciences, ^{up} being for a while considered hostile to revealed religion ; so like them, when fully understood, it will be found a potent and consistent auxiliary to it, exalting our conviction of the Power, and Wisdom, and Goodness of the Creator.

No reasonable man can doubt that all the phenomena of the natural world derive their origin from God ; and no one who believes the Bible to be the word of God, has cause to fear any discrepancy between this, his word, and the results of any discoveries respecting the nature of his works ; but the early

* "In whatever relates, therefore, to *religion*, either in theory or practice, the knowledge of the sacred writers was infallible, as far as it extended, or their inspiration had been a mere pretence ; and in the whole extent of that subject, faith must be renounced, or reason must submit implicitly to their oracular decisions. But in *other subjects*, not immediately connected with *theology* or *moral*s, it is by no means certain that their minds were equally enlightened, or that they were even preserved from gross errors : it is *certain*, on the contrary, that the prophets and apostles might be sufficiently qualified for the task assigned them to be teachers of that wisdom which 'maketh wise unto salvation,' although in the structure and mechanism of the material world they were less informed than Copernicus or Newton, and were less knowing than Harvey in the animal economy."—*Horsley's Sermons*, xxxix. He goes on in a strain more applicable even than this to our argument.

and deliberative stages of scientific discovery are always those of perplexity and alarm, and during these stages the human mind is naturally circumspect, and slow to admit new conclusions in any department of knowledge. The prejudiced persecutors of Galileo apprehended danger to religion, from the discoveries of a science, in which a Kepler and a Newton found demonstration of the most sublime and glorious attributes of the Creator. A Herschel has pronounced that "Geology, in the magnitude and sublimity of the objects of which it treats, undoubtedly ranks in the scale of sciences next to astronomy;" and the history of the structure of our planet, when it shall be fully understood, must lead to the same great moral results that have followed the study of the mechanism of the heavens; geology has already proved by physical evidence, that the surface of the globe has not existed in its actual state from eternity, but has advanced through a series of creative operations, succeeding one another at long and definite intervals of time; that all the actual combinations of matter have had a prior existence in some other state; and that the ultimate atoms of the material elements, through whatever changes they may have passed, are, and ever have been, governed by laws, as regular and uniform, as those which hold the planets in their course. All these results entirely accord with the best feelings of our nature, and with our rational conviction of the greatness and goodness of the Creator of the universe; and the reluctance with which evidences, of such high importance to natural theology, have been admitted by many persons, who are sincerely zealous for the interests of religion, can only be explained by their want of accurate information in physical science; and by their ungrounded fears lest natural phenomena should prove inconsistent with the account of creation in the book of Genesis.

It is argued unfairly against geology, that because its followers are as yet agreed on no complete and incontrovertible theory of the earth; and because early opinions advanced on imperfect evidence have yielded, in succession, to more extensive discoveries; therefore nothing certain is known upon the whole subject; and that all geological deductions must be crude, unauthentic, and conjectural.

It must be candidly admitted that the season has not yet arrived, when a perfect theory of the whole earth can be fixedly and finally established, since we have not yet before us all the facts on which such a theory may eventually be founded; but, in the mean while, we have abundant evidence of numerous and indisputable phenomena, each establishing important and undeniable conclusions; and the aggregate of these conclusions, as they gradually accumulate, will form the basis of future theories, each more and more nearly approximating to perfection; the first, and second, and third story of our edifice may be soundly and solidly constructed; although time must still elapse before the roof and pinnacles of the perfect building can be completed. Admitting, therefore, that we have yet much to learn, we contend that much sound knowledge has been already acquired; and we protest against the rejection of established parts, because the whole is not yet made perfect.—Pp. 8—12.

There can be no necessity for us to mention here, that the different strata of the earth are, in many cases, entirely composed of the remains of beings once animate and full of instinct,* and that it has been

* Two instances out of many hundreds may be here mentioned. Mr. Poulett Scrope describes a fresh-water limestone occurring in the volcanic district of the heart of France, viz., in the Limagne, and occupying an area of many hundred square miles, which is entirely composed of the fossilized cases of the Caddis worm (*Indusia tubulata*), surrounded by "innumerable multitudes of minute shells, chiefly the *Bulimus atomus* of Brongniart, arranged with some symmetry round each tube, and pressing closely on one another." He adds: "More than a hundred of these shells may be counted on each tube, and ten or twelve tubes are constantly packed together within the space of a cubic inch. If, then, we consider that *repeated* strata, averaging five or six feet in

urged against geology, that to allow that those beings lived before the six days, and *died* before the sin of Adam, contradicts the Scripture.

The only argument on this head, which we have seen to deserve notice, is that derived from Romans v. 12,—“ Death entered into the world by sin;” but we give the objection as it has appeared in print.

“ To the opinion maintained by Dr. Buckland and other geologists concerning the existence and death of animals of various descriptions on this earth, prior to the creation and fall of Adam, a theological objection presents itself, which has hitherto been unnoticed by your correspondents.

“ Not only Milton, but St. Paul, declares, not only universal tradition, but the word of God teaches, that death was introduced into this world as ‘the consequence or penalty of sin.’ ‘By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin.’ ‘By one man’s offence, death reigned by one.’ ‘The wages of sin is death.’

“ Nor will it be satisfactory to reply, that this penalty of death applies only to the human race; for St. Paul goes on to say, in the same epistle, ‘We know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.’ That is, the whole creation, rational and irrational, is become subject to the corruption and punishment entailed on it through Adam’s transgression.

“ And if the geologist, in defence of his system, asserts farther, that the present globe of the earth was not made new for the reception of its present race of inhabitants, but was re-moulded and re-compacted out of former materials into the shape and substance we now behold it, we may again retort in the language of Scripture, ‘That the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.’ Therefore it is incumbent on

thickness, and almost entirely composed of these tubes, appear once to have extended over the whole plain of the Linagne, occupying a surface of many hundred square miles, we shall arrive at an imperfect idea of the countless myriads of minute beings belonging to a single species of Mollusca, which have lived and died in turn within the bosom of this once extensive lake! Such a reflection, like many others of a similar stamp, which occur at every step to the investigation of Nature, recalls that trite but true French saying, ‘Dieu est grand dans les grandes choses, mais il est encore plus grand dans les petites.’” (*Memoir on the Geology of Central France, including the Volcanic Formations of Auvergne, &c., p. 16.*)

The other fact is detailed in the following extract from the anniversary address of Mr. Lyell, delivered before the Geological Society, 19th February, 1836:—

“ While on this subject I may mention a discovery made by Mr. Lonsdale during the last summer, and which he has permitted me to announce. In arranging our collection, he has found that our common white chalk, especially the upper portion of it, taken from different parts of England, (Portsmouth and Brighton amongst others,) is full of minute corals, foraminifera, and valves of a small entomostracous animal, resembling the Cytherina of Lamarck. From a pound of chalk he has procured, in some cases, at least a thousand of these fossil bodies. They appear to the eye like white grains of chalk; but, when examined by the lens, are seen to be fossils in a beautiful state of preservation.” (*Proceedings of the Geological Society, vol. ii. p. 365.*)

Dr. Buckland alludes to this discovery in the work before us, vol. i. p. 448.

Dr. Buckland, in support of his hypothesis, independent of every minor consideration, in the first place, to disprove these and other texts of a similar import; otherwise he will fail to convince, by the most specious reasoning, a true believer in the inspired oracles, that death, under any circumstances, took place before the period of Adam's transgression; and consequently that the exuviae of animals now discovered in the strata of the earth could have been deposited before the era of the Creation recorded by Moses. Dr. Buckland promises to explain all these matters in his forthcoming treatise: but we fear the mischief is done; for it must occur to every serious mind, that this trifling with texts of Scripture, involving the doctrine of the Atonement, and other most important articles of the Christian faith, this 'being wise above what is written,' opens a door to the errors of Socinianism, and to tenets of the worst description." *FIDUS.—St. James's Chron. Oct. 1, 1836.*

Macknight and Bloomfield both treat the subject, as solely in reference to *man*, and the authorities they cite confirm the view of "death the wages of sin." The expression of the apostle is, *ὅτι ἐνὸς αὐθιρώπον ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε;* but will Fidus take on himself to say, that *κόσμος*, when applied solely to animated beings, includes the *brute creation*?* If so, let him produce a single authority for it: moreover, St. Paul positively limits the word to *man* in the verse before us, (*Rom. v. 12.*) *καὶ οὐτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος ἐιῆλθεν;* besides, if death passed upon *animals* BECAUSE of Adam's sin, since the apostle introduces the atonement as more than repairing the fall, but extending to *all* who suffered for *sin* (ver. 18), the atonement, on the showing of Fidus, and not of the geologists, must extend to *brute animals* also! and the reproof at the end of his letter must fall with fearful force upon his own head! There are other arguments. If death fell on *brute animals* BECAUSE of *Adam's sin*, then were all *animals*, as well as *man*, originally *immortal*. Will Fidus admit this? To Adam in Paradise there was a tree of *life*, and a tree of *knowledge of good and evil*,—to the rest of creation there was neither; *their immortality* must therefore have depended on no *means*, but have been *innate*, and so, superior to that of Adam.† Besides, how are we to interpret the curse of death,—

* The definition of *κόσμος* by Aristotle is this. *Κόσμος μὲν οὐν ἔστι σύστημα ἢ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, καὶ τῶν ἐν τούτοις περιεχομένων φυσέων λέγεται δὲ καὶ ἑτέρας κόσμος ἡ τῶν ὄντων τάξις τε καὶ διακόσμησις, ὑπὸ θεοῦ τε καὶ διὰ θεῶν φυλαττομένη, &c.* (*De Mondo.*) Even this classical definition makes no distinction, so as to allow *κόσμος* to be applied to *animals* alone: and in the Scriptures, it is never so applied: when by metonymy it is used of animated nature, it is always referred to communities of *human beings*.

† It will be seen that we here regard the tree of life as of a *sacramental* nature,—not the cause of life, but the *means* of its continuance to immortal Adam. Whether we admit, however, this interpretation of the "tree of life" with Kennicott, or with Mr. Winning, (*Essays on the Antediluvian Age*, p. 159,) consider it as the "preservative of Adam's obedience," our argument does not suffer. The whole tenor of St. Paul's remarks in *Romans v.* is to the effect of a comparison between the fall of the first Adam and the restoration in the second Adam; and if the 18th verse of that chapter did not,

"*Thou shalt surely die?" — thou* shalt die by death? as, beforehand, having influence of terror in the mind of Adam, if he did not know what death was? In the dialogue between the serpent and Eve, there is no question as to *what death meant*,—Eve perfectly understood it: the only doubt was, as to the truth of God, in keeping his word. And we read, that *immediately* after the fall, God clothed Adam and Eve with *coats of skins*; this, too, *before* he was put forth from the tree of *life*. All these considerations lead to the inference that the death of animals may have occurred before Adam's sin, and that it probably did; for the chief weight of the threat to Adam seems to be in this:—*Thou, who art alone immortal amongst these creatures of my hand, shalt also die as they, if thou disobeyest my command.*

As to the passage cited from Rom. viii. 22, Fidus cannot surely mean to adhere to the interpretation of $\pi\alpha\sigma\eta \dot{\eta} \kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\zeta$, as including *the brute creation*,—however poetical it may be,—when he considers how the expression is used in Col. i. 23, and Mark. xvi. 15; and when he refers to the context, in which $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\zeta$ (see v. 19, 20, 21) means *man*, and then goes on to v. 23, where a distinction is made between *mankind* generally and *Christians in particular*; for, to adduce so disputed a word as $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\zeta$ to settle peremptorily an equally disputed point, is literally jumping to a conclusion, and begging the question, *sub judice*.*

The other passage quoted from Heb. xi. 3, is brought in to make weight unnecessarily: according to the commentators, the assertion that "*the worlds were framed by THE WORD OF GOD*, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear," is an illustration of the Creatorship of Christ, and an argument *against the eternity of matter*: those words certainly must be greatly strained to be advanced in opposition to a theory of *two different states of one world*, when they simply refer to the omnipotence of God in creating the matter of the world at first, before either state had been induced.

Burnet, we know, long ago held a doctrine precisely similar to that we have endeavoured to establish respecting the *primitive deluge* mentioned in Gen. i. 2. His opinions are remarkable, and have been referred to by Dr. Bloomfield (on 2 Pet. iii. 6), where the latter observes, that the conjecture of Burnet is adopted by Rosenmüller, and confirmed

as well as the 12th, refer the whole subject to *man only*, the 21st verse would extend, in Fidus's reasoning, not only *past*, but *future*, immortality to the *brute creation*.

* If $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\zeta$ in Rom. viii. 22, does mean *brute animals*, as well as *man*, then we must declare, on the authority of all the commentators, that *brute animals* have a hope of immortality; such is the real result of Fidus's argument! and yet he ventures to rate others for "trifling with texts of Scripture," involving the doctrine of the Atonement!—"being wise above what is written,"—opening a door to the errors of Socinianism, &c. Surely Fidus interprets St. Paul, as an American Indian would do; for, according to Pope,—

He "thinks admitted to that equal sky,
His faithful dog shall bear him company."

by the recent discoveries of geology. He allows that St. Peter's words are capable of application, though also consistent with reference to Noah's deluge. The argument, however, from the whole passage in St. Peter, philologically considered, is in favour of a reference to Gen. i. 2 rather than to Gen. viii., and as such we re-quote some of Rosenmüller's remarks. “*O τότε κόσμος quid sit, de eo ambiguunt interpres. Plerique intelligunt homines tempore diluvii viventes, et respici putant ad narrationem Mosaicam, Gen. vii. 11. Enimvero quum ei non opponatur ὁ νῦν κόσμος sed οἱ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ videtur Apostolus cælos hos ac terram hanc ab aliis distinguere, nec per inundationem illam, qua periit prior mundus, Noachicum intelligere diluvium quo nec cælum nec totum genus humanum interiit. *** Mihi plane persuasum est, aliud olim cælum, i. e. aliam externam faciem cæli et terræ fuisse ante illud diluvium tempore Noæ immissum terris, &c. *** Verisimilis est mihi eorum sententia, qui statuunt, orbem terrarum *dui* post *primam illam universi hujus creationem inundatione quadam universalis, illo Noachico diluvio multo terribiliore et diuturniore penitus esse devastatum, omnibusque quibus antea ornatus erat rebus spoliatum; renovatum autem deinde a Deo, et habitationem factum esse hominum et animalium huncque metamorphosim describi a Mose.*” (Scholia in N.T. v. 499.) It is remarkable that St. Peter in the eighth verse goes on to say, that with Jehovah “one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.” We have room only to add to the above review of the disputed point before us, a quotation from an independent authority, which must have weight.*

“I am not aware,” says the late Dr. Burton, “of any passage in which the Apostles declare, that God created the world out of nothing. This was one of the questions which exercised the learned in the schools: but it was not one with which the Apostles chose to encumber the minds of their hearers.* *Whether the world was created by God, or by an inferior being, was a very different question.* It involved directly the majesty of God, and indirectly the whole scheme of Christian redemption. All the practical errors, which arose out of a belief in the eternity of matter, were exposed and condemned by the Apostles: *but the belief itself, like other physical and metaphysical points, was left to the gradual development of knowledge;* when at length it will be seen, as I have already observed, that *to conceive God not to have the power of creating or annihilating matter, is one of the most palpable inconsistencies which the human intellect can entertain.*”—(Heresies of the Apostolic Age, p. 123.)

Whether or not Dr. Buckland's opponents fall within the range of

* “I only know of one passage which contains any thing like an allusion to a philosophical opinion about the creation; and that is 2 Peter iii. 5: but this appears to contain an ancient notion of the Jews. See Psalm xxiv. 2. cxxxvi. 6.”

Dr. Burton's reproof, it is not our business to determine. But if the consideration which we have here given to the point they question, (and we have no further interest in it than belongs to the elucidation of truth,) shall avail so far as to moderate the zeal of those gentlemen, by convincing them, that the opinions in dispute are not so heretical or so dangerous as they imagine, nor so undefended and unsupported as they declare, we shall have the satisfaction of having removed a great impediment in the way of the circulation of this interesting, able, eloquent, and learned addition to the evidences of Natural Theology; and of having done something to recommend a publication, the sole undivided object of which must be left for the distinguished veteran in research, himself to describe.

The whole course of the inquiry which we have now conducted to its close, has shown that the physical history of our globe, in which some have seen only Waste, Disorder, and Confusion, teems with endless examples of Economy, and Order, and Design; and the result of all our researches, carried back through the unwritten records of past time, has been to fix more steadily our assurance of the existence of one supreme Creator of all things, to exalt more highly our conviction of the immensity of his perfections, of his might, and majesty, his wisdom, and goodness, and all-sustaining providence; and to penetrate our understanding with a profound and sensible perception of the "high veneration man's intellect owes to God."

The earth, from her deep foundations, unites with the celestial orbs that roll through boundless space, to declare the glory and show forth the praise of their common Au'hor and Preserver; and the voice of Natural Religion accords harmoniously with the testimonies of Revelation, in ascribing the origin of the universe to the will of one eternal and dominant Intelligence, the Almighty Lord and supreme first cause of all things that subsist—"the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever"—"before the mountains were brought forth, or ever the earth and the world were made, God from everlasting and world without end."—Pp. 595, 596.

We hope in our next Number to show how far these triumphant assertions have been justified and proved, and how completely the charge of "*Atheism*" has been wantonly and wickedly played with, in the controversy on this splendid performance.*

* Page 11 line 30, in our last number, for "Ceutah" read "Cutch."—During the destructive earthquake in Cutch, in 1819, water bubbled up from the wells, and from the tract on each side of the Runn, "overwhelming the country in some places with six and even ten feet of water." (Byrn's Travels into Bokhara, iii. p. 324.)

During the earthquake in Baden, in Jan. 1834, it was observed, that floods occurred without rain, simply by the increased flow of water from the springs at the river-heads of the country. Holinshed (p. 238.) mentions a similar phenomenon in the year 1040, when, during the earthquake of that year, in Scotland, the ground poured forth torrents of water. Water also burst from fissures in the earth, during the great earthquake in Chili, 20th Feb. 1835, (P. G. S. ii. p. 373.) These facts are introduced here to justify our former remarks. We think it right also to add, that in alluding to the use of $\delta\nu\ \delta\rho\xi\eta$ in John i. 1, as not necessarily implying eternity, when compared with John i. 4, we did not mean to assert any thing bearing the very slightest allusion upon any but the orthodox belief respecting the eternity of The Word. His eternity and creatornship are so clearly expressed in other passages of the New Testament that there can be no question about them, even if we assume the $\delta\nu\ \delta\rho\xi\eta$ to be an indefinite or definite point in eternity. It means really "before the creation of the world." (Vid. Rec. Synopt. iii. 1.)

LITERARY REPORT.

Historique, Conférences, Liturgies, et Sermons. Genève et Paris. 2 vols. 8vo. 1835.

Souvenirs du Jubilé pour la Paroisse de Chêne. Par J. MARTIN, Pasteur. Genève et Paris. 8vo. 1835.

THE Jubilee of the Reformation was celebrated at Geneva, in August 1835, with a degree of enthusiasm which those only, perhaps, who were present will be able to appreciate. Deputies had been invited from the different Protestant churches of Europe; and must have carried away with them an impression which ages will never efface. Never were the principles of genuine liberality and christian charity more unequivocally evinced; never were the precepts of the gospel more powerfully illustrated; never was the hospitality of the rich, or love for the poor, more cordially dispensed; and even the Romanists, who constitute a moiety of the population, yielded to the influence of universal toleration, and, holding forth the right hand of fellowship to their Protestant neighbours, were fain to "rejoice with them that did rejoice." In the former of the works to which we would draw attention by this notice, we have a brief sketch of the general proceedings; the conferences held by the pastors and deputies from the several churches of England, France, Switzerland, Germany, Russia, Prussia, and America; the forms of Prayer cited upon the occasion; and Six Discourses delivered in as many churches, which breathe throughout the most earnest piety, the most devoted patriotism, and the most fervent charity. The "Souvenirs" of M. Martin contain a simple and unaffected narrative of the manner in which the *Fête* was celebrated in his own parish, which is composed of Protestants and Romanists in nearly equal

proportion. Almost every college was illuminated, and *Tolerance et Liberté* was the device in general vogue, and seemed to be the feeling of every heart.

Hints to Religious Ladies on the Importance and Advantages of Mental Cultivation. London : Seeleys. Pp. 48. 1836.

A SENSIBLE little tract, very useful for women above the middle rank, who would be respected for good sense, enlarged ideas, and extensive information. It displays no inconsiderable knowledge of the female heart; and we entertain a hope, with its judicious author, that its shortness, and its being confined to one point, may procure it the attention of some who would not venture on a larger work.

An Account of Mr. Husenbeth's Professed Refutation of the Argument of the Difficulties of Romanism, on the entirely new principle of a Refusal to meet it. By GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B. D. London : 1836. Pp. 50.

THIS is indeed an unanswerable answer, convicting Mr. Husenbeth of bad temper, bad manners, bad argument, and utter ignorance. As a scholar, a divine, a polemic, and a gentleman, he is worthy of the wretched cause to which he has addressed himself. Mr. Faber, indeed, might well chaunt over his prostrate assailant the disdainful song,

" Honour and arms scorn such a foe !
Though I could end thee at a blow !
Poor victory ! to conquer thee,
Or glory in thy overthrow !
Vanquish a slave that is half-slain !
So mean a triumph I disdain."*

* Handel's Songs.

A Letter to the Editor of the Quarterly Review, in Reply to certain Strictures in that Publication on the Rev. Dr. Keith's "Evidence of Prophecy." From the Rev. JAMES BREWSTER, Minister of Craig. Edinburgh: Whyte and Co. 1836. Pp. 68.

DR. KEITH may be heartily congratulated by his friends upon this very powerful and satisfactory Defence from the grave charges urged against him by the Quarterly Review. Looking to the triumphant issue of this plea, and to the additional credit and the increased circulation of the work so bitterly and unjustly assailed, we may be allowed to say of the seeming plagiarism of Dr. Keith,

"Si non errasset, feceret ille minus."*

Leisure Musings; &c. By the Rev. JAMES HOLME, A.B. London: Hamilton; Simpkin; Nisbet. Leeds: Knight. Pp. 152.

CLAIMING no pretension to merit, the author of this little collection of poetical musings deprecates critical censure with that modesty which real talent always feels, even when praise is justly due. The pieces have something of a mournful tone, but many of them are eminently beautiful; and, though there is unquestionably great inequality in the volume, all are far above mediocrity. Our space this month will not admit of extracts; we therefore must be content to direct our readers to the pleasing volume itself, which we trust will obtain for our author that attention which he fairly deserves.

Six Discourses on the Nature and Influence of Faith. By the Rev. W. BURGH, A.B. Dublin: Curry. London: Simpkin & Co. 1835. Pp. 173.

THESE Discourses were preached in the Dublin Female Penitentiary Chapel, and are published at the request of those to whom they were there addressed. We need not say how little we accord with our author in his Calvinisms. We deny that our "moral sense is totally depraved," and that

"human nature is utterly corrupt;" in that case, would man be responsible for his sins? In that case, "the apostles of our religion might as well have wasted their breath on the stones of the wilderness as on the hearts of their fellow-men in the cities of the heathen."† When Mr. Burgh talks of the unconditional pardon of all offences by Christ, he makes our holy Redeemer the minister of sin, or there is no meaning in his rash assertions. We know well enough,—who does not know?—the quibbling sophistry by which divines of his school evade this charge; we know well enough,—who does not know? that it is an easy thing to explain away this unscriptural doctrine, but the assertion itself is not the less to be condemned on account of its utter falseness, and its obvious mischievousness.

"They teach," (our author writes, i. e. systems in opposition to his own teach,) "that on man's obedience depends more or less his acceptance; which is to appeal to selfish motives to produce an influence the most remote possible from selfishness, an influence which consists altogether in love."—P. 82.

The metaphysics of our author are on a par here with his divinity; and both are equally at variance with sound philosophy and the word of God. What possible good can arise from such rash assertions? When our Saviour preached to females, he told them "to sin no more," lest sorcer judgment should overtake them. Would Mr. Burgh class him with his opponent? Does not our Saviour, at least, seem to insist upon repentance as a condition of pardon, and to appeal to the fear of aggravated punishment as one motive to newness of life, in the memorable instance of the woman taken in adultery?—Our author has taught his hearers, that "it is impossible to believe any thing without being influenced accordingly."—P. 58. Then why are we exhorted to add to our faith the whole catalogue of christian virtues? But we waste our ink in the refutation of such hackneyed errors, and therefore

* Martial.

† Sedgwick's Discourse on the Studies of the University of Cambridge, p. 59.

forbear to dwell upon them, though our righteous indignation is sorely tempted to chastise such audacious ministers as presume to tell their credulous and hungry dupes, that "they have nothing to do with the gospel, but to believe it."—P. 26.

One word more with Mr. Burgh, and we have done. He contends that the christian faith, which justifies a man, is the mere belief of the revealed truth of God, without any thing of the nature of trust. We beg leave to refer our author to the Homilies of our Church, in which we are taught thus: "The right and true christian faith is, not only to believe, that holy Scripture, and all the foresaid articles of our faith, are true, but also to have a sure trust and confidence in God's merciful promises, whereof doth follow a loving heart to obey his commandments."* Mr. Burgh may be a very pious and zealous preacher, for aught we know; but, unfortunately, piety and zeal are compatible with grievous errors, and indomitable self-sufficiency!

Sacred Pneumatology, or the Scripture Doctrine of the Holy Spirit; in Three Books. By the Rev. JOSEPH WILSON, A.M. Minister of Laxton, Northamptonshire. London: Seeleys. 1836. Pp. 358.

A USEFUL treatise, not without errors of considerable magnitude. It is too long for a manual of devotion, and too short for a full exposition of the momentous points to which it is addressed. The author has divided his investigation into three books, thus respectively headed:—Book I. On the Divine Nature, Person, and Attributes of the Holy Spirit. Book II. On the extraordinary operations of the Holy Ghost. Book III. On the ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit, as a Sanctifier, and Comforter, and Intercessor. It is much beyond the province of our "Literary Report," to treat of such subjects as here occupy the mind of our author. It can only be allowed us to glance cursorily at the general character of his work: and therefore be it observed, that in our

judgment, there is much irrelevant matter introduced into this volume; of which character perhaps the very first chapter might be adduced as an example, because the doctrine of the Trinity, however necessary to a right knowledge of God, does not strictly belong to a view of the scripture doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Perhaps the best thing to be said of Mr. Wilson's Pneumatology is, that it contains but little novelty, and is replete with quotations from Butler, Owen, Burkitt, Whitby, Leland, Doddridge, Pearson, and Jones,—oases more than sufficient to give an air of beauty and fertility to a dry desert of many volumes. Mr. Wilson has fallen into the vulgar error of discerning types, where none but a poetic imagination could conceive even a similitude; and this especially applies to his fancies touching the points of typical resemblance between the Holy Spirit and the Dove; and again, between the Holy Ghost and the Wind. Nor is this the whole of our author's mistakes. He goes even so far as to assign an influence so the Sanctifier, like that of fire, which is said "to have the power of hardening some substances while it softens others."—P. 72. We would recommend our author to revise this portion of his volume (if opportunity be given him), and to make his phraseology less obnoxious to exception. What Mr. Wilson has written upon the common theme of "the Inspiration of the Scriptures," and the excellence of Holy Writ, is sensible and obvious enough; but the latter moiety seems, we confess, to have but indirect connexion with "Sacred Pneumatology," and might have been advantageously compressed.

There is much very questionable matter in our author's lucubrations, Book II. c. 4, § 6, touching the ascription of mechanical inventions, and other discoveries, such as *Clocks, Telescopes, Paper, Gunpowder, the Mariner's Needle, and Printing*, to God's Holy Spirit, which can be admitted upon no principle but such as would make God the author of sin, and the

* Homilies, fol. edit. p. 18. See much more to the same purpose,—pp. 19, 20, 23.

source of all evil! All this, surely, is gross delusion, and mischievous conceit! Our author might just as well ascribe the Gunpowder Plot, as gunpowder, to the inspiration of the Spirit of the Deity! And it is a matter of grievous dissatisfaction to find any one of the Church of England advocating such unscriptural and unphilosophical views. We old-fashioned folk of the CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCE nauseate such varieties; nor are we forward to ascribe the establishment of certain societies to Him "who is not the author of confusion, but of peace;" and who has branded schism as a damnable sin, and enjoined his servants to "mark them which cause divisions, and avoid them," rather than give our right hand of fellowship to associations whose direct tendency it is to lower the sense of the sin and mischief of dissent! "O, my soul, come not thou into their secret! unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united!"*

Again: we must assume the privilege of raising our eyes in astonishment at the introduction of the history of Colonel Gardiner, as related by Dr. Doddridge, after what Paley, with his wonted good sense, has said upon that doubtful narrative, and the impropriety of admitting "as a miracle what can be resolved into a false perception."† We have said that Mr. Wilson's volume is too long for a manual of devotion: considering the detailed history which he has given of some of the fruits of the Spirit, our only wonder is, that his modest octavo did not swell into divers tomes of gigantic folio. Taking in the Invention of Gunpowder, as before alluded to, and all other kindred discoveries, we see no reason why our laborious author might not have published, under the title of "Sacred Pneumatology," a voluminous encyclopædia, "de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis;" that such was not his pious pleasure we bless ourselves with no common congratulation!

The Works of Thomas Chalmers, D.D. and LL.D., &c. &c. &c. Vols. I. and II. Glasgow: Collins. London: Hamilton.

OF this very beautiful edition of Dr. Chalmers' eloquent and learned works it is impossible to speak too highly. We take unfeigned shame to ourselves for the tardiness of our official notice, and would plead pressure of critical engagements as our best apology to the author, the publisher, and the public. But panegyric would be useless where immortal praise is already awarded by ten thousand delighted readers: and censure would be vain where universal admiration has crowned a writer with unfading laurels,— "doctrarum præmia frontium." What necessity is there for lauding the Iliad? Who regards the calumnies of Zoilus?

A Short Exposition of the Order for the Burial of the Dead, with a view to the Improvement and Consolation of the Living. By AN OLD COLLEGE INCUMBENT. London: Seeleys. Pp. 88. 1836.

THIS IS an excellent little volume, conceived in a truly christian spirit, and executed with considerable success. After some introductory remarks on reverence for the bodies of the dead, and on interment, the venerable author considers the Burial Service under three aspects, which form the subject of three sections. First, the introductory sentences, when the body is brought into the church-yard; next, the service in the church; and lastly, the service at the grave. We are bound to add our conviction that in each of these sections will be found "much closely applicable to the living, and well adapted for the improvement of the mind, and for the consolation of the heart."

* Gen. xlix. 6.

† Paley's Evidences, Prop. 2. c. i. 6, 7.

A SERMON,*

ON THE MARTYRDOM OF KING CHARLES OF BLESSED MEMORY,
13TH JAN. 1725.†

JUDGES xi. 10.

And it was so, that all that saw it said, There was no such deed done, nor seen, from the day that the children of Israel came up out of the land of Egypt, unto this day : consider of it, take advice, and speak your minds.

THE barbarous fact to which these words refer is set forth at large, with all the aggravating circumstances, in the foregoing verses of this chapter. To enter into the particulars of it is neither necessary nor proper; I shall only in general observe,—That it was committed in a time of anarchy and confusion, when there was no king in Israel ;—that it was not a crime of one single denomination, but a complicated piece of villainy, involving in it the guilt of many gross and enormous sins ;—and that the persons concerned in the commission of it were certain “sons of Balial,” void of all pity, regardless of shame, and as unrestrained by any principles of religion or remorse of conscience, as if they had been equally sure that there was no God in heaven, as that there was no king in Israel.

This consummate wickedness was done in Gibeah, and a report of it sent to the tribes of Israel. All those whom the fame of it reached did, upon their first hearing it, pronounce that “there was no such deed done, from the day that the children of Israel came up out of the land of Egypt, till that day.” But although they had, without the least deliberating about it in their own breasts, and without consulting the opinions of others, passed this judgment upon it, yet they are all called upon farther “to consider of it, to take advice, and to speak their minds.” So that from the words there do arise these three observations :

First, That there are some actions so shocking, that all men do, upon the first hearing of them,—without taking time to consider, without asking the opinion of others,—unanimously agree to condemn.

Secondly, That although such actions do, at the first view, appear very odious, yet in order to confirm or rectify our judgments of them, it is proper to consider them farther, and to take in the advice of others.

Thirdly, That when any actions do, both at first view, and also upon further inquiry, appear very flagitious, we should then, without any reserve, openly speak our minds concerning them. To each of these I shall speak severally, and apply what I shall say upon each to that execrable fact, for which we are this day humbling ourselves in the sight of God.

* Extracts from the unpublished MSS. of the late Reverend Stephen Isaacson, B.A. Rector of Freckenham.

† At a time when the repeated attacks on the life of the King of France, and the rumoured conspiracies against other continental monarchs, are daily thrust upon our notice, it may not be considered inopportune if we lay before our readers a Sermon on the murder of our gracious sovereign Charles I. preached upwards of a century since, by the Rev. S. Isaacson, Rector of Freckenham, in which the crime of regicide is powerfully denounced, and the assassins held up to that public execration, with which we hope Englishmen will always look upon traitors.

First, then, I observe, that there are some actions so shocking that all men do, upon the first hearing of them,—without taking time to consider, without asking the opinion of others,—unanimously agree to condemn.

However men may differ in their opinions concerning the measures of truth, and the ways by which we do arrive at the first notion of things, yet it is agreed by all, because attested by the common experience of all, that there are some truths which we do more easily discover, and more readily and firmly assent to, than others. For some are the results of long inquiry and close reasoning, whilst others offer themselves to our thoughts of their own accord; thrust themselves upon our attention whether we will or not; and seem not so much to court our assent, as to command it. We find ourselves necessarily determined, in some cases, to judge one way rather than another; and, though we strive never so much, we cannot prevail upon ourselves to alter, or so much as to call in question, our judgments.

These truths, when examined afterwards by reason, are found to be very agreeable to it; but they do not wait for such examination before they can gain admittance into our belief, but are allowed, without passing any tests, barely on their own account and credit. Those who never reason at all about them, are as strongly, though not upon so good grounds, persuaded of them, as those who reason most: and though they may be capable of receiving, from proof and authority, an additional strength, yet they do not at all want it.

Now among those truths which do thus prevent all reasoning, and gain our assent upon the first view, I think we may justly reckon those judgments which we form concerning the essential difference of moral good and evil. For our eye is not more quick in discerning the variety of figures and colours, nor more taken with the beauty of some, or displeased with the deformity of others; the nicest ear hath not a more distinct perception of the harmony or discord of sounds, than our intellectual faculties do apprehend the plain and familiar distinction between right and wrong, honest and dishonest, good and evil, and find an agreeableness and satisfaction in one, and a disagreeableness and dissatisfaction in the other.

Hence it is that the Prophet Isaiah, when he pronounceth a curse against all those who confounded what God had plainly distinguished, supposes the opposite kinds of human actions to be at as great a distance, the one from the other, as the most contrary qualities, which we are informed of by the report of our senses; “Wo unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.”

All men are not endued with a penetration of thought, so much strength of reasoning, so much dexterity and skill, in deducing one truth from another, as to discover, or so much as perceive the force of those arguments, which may be brought to prove a thing wicked and abominable; but without reasoning, without drawing any long train of inferences, without inquiring into the hidden grounds and causes of the evil, all, who are not destitute of common sense, do quickly perceive in gross and heinous sins, that monstrous turpitude and deformity, which is in itself visible, and not to be overlooked.

Thus, as soon as the children of Israel were informed that a daughter of one of their tribes had, by the men of Gibeah, in a violent and out-

Fageous manner, been assaulted, abused, and murdered, the indignation which immediately arose in the breast of every one who heard of it, superseded the necessity of any tedious search into the precise demerits of the action: and the voice of all the people spoke aloud, what the voice of nature had before whispered to each man's private thoughts, that so unparalleled a wickedness deserved the severest censure, and warranted the keenest resentment.

— And doth not the treason of *this day* kindle in our breasts the like just indignation? Can we hear of a loving prince murdered by his own unnatural subjects; and doth not the bare mention of it excite in our minds the utmost abhorrence of so barbarous an action? Do not our ears tingle as soon as we hear of it? Are not our spirits immediately in a ferment, at the first report thereof? Doth not a fire presently burn within us? Do we not feel our hearts glowing, on a sudden, with a holy zeal against so ungodly, so inhuman, so unchristian a deed? And are we not, by a sort of natural instinct, which prevents all reasoning, which leaves no room for deliberation, forcibly determined to conceive in our thoughts, and with our tongues to express, a perfect hatred of it? Can we look upon it to be necessary, can we judge it to be even so much as lawful for us, calmly and sedately to deliberate, whether such a fact is to be condemned or not? And should we not betray too much indifference and lukewarmness, if we should take time to consider and advise before we pretend to form any judgment about it? Need we suspend our opinions about it till we have more carefully and thoroughly examined it? Are we afraid of being rash and precipitate, unless we impartially weigh, in an equal balance, what is to be said for it, as well as what is to be said against it? Must we wait till the *apologists of rebellion and murder* have brought forth their strong reasons, and till we have tried the strength of those pleas, which they have to advance in defence of their *bloodshed and parricide*, before we proceed to determine any thing in our thoughts about them? Might we not in this case safely appeal to the first judgments of those who are so hardy as to defend *this day's treason*, or even of those who were so wicked as to commit it?

For, though there be no crime so heinous which may not find some advocates; none so shocking to human nature which men, violently pushed on by the instigation of the devil, and given over to a reprobate mind by the just judgments of God, may not bring themselves at last to consent to; yet we have no reason to doubt but that the execrable fact of which we are now speaking, did, at the first proposal of it, appear in the same colours to the patrons of it, yea, and to the traitors themselves concerned in it, as it doth to other men; that natural conscience did, in them, for some time, bear the same testimony against it, as it still doth in others; and that they must have taken a great deal of pains to stifle the convictions of their own minds, before they could bring themselves to excuse, to justify, and to approve an action, which must, at first, have struck them, (if they were not of a different make from all other men,) with a natural horror and aversion.

But that we may not seem, in a matter of so great moment, to lay too much stress upon the first judgments that men form, which, after all, perhaps, may be but prejudices, it will be proper for us to proceed to our second conclusion; that, although some actions do, at the first view, appear very odious, yet, in order to confirm or rectify our first judgments

of them, it is proper to consider them farther, and to take in the advice of others.

When an action is immediately to be done by us, and there is no time allowed us to deliberate about it, the dictates of our own conscience, being the best guides we have, must be followed by us. But concerning actions already done, we have more leisure to judge, and, therefore, ought to take more care to judge aright. If they do at first view appear wicked, it is a shrewd indication that they are so in an eminent degree; but upon a further examination into the several circumstances of them, we may find either good reasons to alter our first opinion, or clearer evidence to confirm us in it.

Such notions as prevail in the age in which we live, and among the persons with whom we converse; such as, have been instilled into our minds from our infancy, and have all along grown with us; such as we have often heard inculcated, and never contradicted, we are apt to look upon as engraven on our hearts by the finger of God, when, perhaps, after all, they are only the prejudices of false education. That we may not, therefore, be misled into error by any such prepossessions, it will be expedient for us to re-examine our former judgments, and to inquire how things will appear upon nicer and closer scrutiny.

When a thing appears crooked to the eye at first view, we cannot but pay so much deference to the testimony of the senses, as to presume it such. But because this appearance may sometimes chance to arise from a defect in the visual organ, and not from any real crookedness in the object, for our better satisfaction we measure it with a rule, and then pronounce with more certainty concerning it. And the same method ought to be adopted in judging of moral actions: if they at first view appear notoriously wicked, we cannot but entertain a violent suspicion of their being such: but, because this appearance may arise from some corruption of our judgment, when there is no obliquity in the actions themselves, the best way to prevent all possibility of error, will be to examine them by the only infallible test, the law of God. If they will abide that trial, they are not to be by us rashly condemned; if, upon a deliberate, fair, and impartial examination, they are found plainly repugnant to the revealed will of God, we cannot be thought too dogmatical or peremptory in passing sentence of condemnation against them.

Now, if we take these measures in regulating our judgments concerning the black treason which has made this day to us a day of shame and reproach, a day of mourning and lamentation; if we examine it narrowly in all its parts; if we try it by the rules of morality, law, or religion, there will be as much difference between the degrees of guilt which will then appear, and those which it seemed to have upon a transitory view, as there is between the dimensions of an object closely observed by the help of the best glasses, and slightly glanced upon by the naked eye. But this flagitious wickedness hath been so often and thoroughly considered, that I think it needless to enter upon that point, and shall, therefore, pass at once to what is observed in the third and last place.

"When any actions do, upon first view, and also upon further inquiry, appear very flagitious, we should then, without any reserve, openly and freely speak our mind concerning them."

In vain do the natural consciences bear testimony against notorious and crying sins; in vain is that testimony strengthened by the concur-

rent suffrages of reason and religion; if, when we have taken due care to form our opinions aright, and are under any obligations of justice and charity to declare them, we are either so false to speak against our minds, or so pusillanimous as not to declare them frankly and plainly. A mark of infamy hath, by the universal consent of all civilized nations, been set upon some actions, tending either to the great disparagement of human nature, or to the great disturbance of civil societies, in order that a sense of shame, and fear of disgrace, might be powerful curbs to restrain men from doing such vile things as would be sure to stain their reputations, and to fix an indelible blot of ignominy upon their memories. But this dread of ignominy can no longer prove a restraint, than whilst actions truly reproachful meet with that just reproach which they deserve.

But this law of opinion, or reputation, whereby it is agreed that such and such vices should be punished with disrepute, will, like other laws, lose all its force and energy, unless those who are intrusted with the administration of it, take care to put it duly in execution.

Whatever good reasons there are why the names of persons eminent for virtue should be mentioned with esteem in their own time, and delivered down with honour to posterity, the same are equally strong for branding the memories of wicked men with lasting marks of disgrace: since the canonizing of saints doth not more manifestly tend to the advancement of virtue, than the stigmatizing of villainy doth to the suppression of vice. There are, indeed, greater rewards laid up for the godly, and sorcer judgments kept in store for sinners, than their being remembered with honour and infamy. But still it is one considerable part of the just man's recompense, that his memory shall be blessed, and of the wicked man's punishment, (which ought to come home to him,) that his name shall rot.

The greatest mischief that can possibly be done to the souls of men, is to *discourage* them from doing their duty, by speaking *ill* of what God has commanded; and to *encourage* them in the commission of sin, by speaking *well* of what God has condemned. And, therefore, a woe is, as you have heard, justly denounced by the prophet Isaiah against those "who call evil good, and good evil;" and therefore those priests are accused by God, of violating his laws, and profaning his holy things, who "put no difference between the holy and profane, neither show the difference between the clean and the unclean."

A false notion seems to be taken up of late years, as if it were not consistent with a true christian temper to inveigh against the treason of those regicides who imbrued their hands in the blood of our martyred sovereign: as if it became us rather to cast a veil over it, than to expose it to public view; and as if the memorials of it ought, at last, to be discontinued, lest by going on to rip up old sores, we transgress the bounds of charity and moderation.

But are *murder* and *rebellion* sins that, at any time, ought to be touched lightly, and handled with caution and gentleness? or are those sins become less abominable in the sight of God, or less detestable by good men, in our days, than they were in the days of our fathers? Hath not the legislative authority set apart this day, on purpose that the guilt of that innocent and sacred blood, which was shed thereon, might be confessed and lamented? and should that guilt be on such occasions stifled,

extenuated, and dissembled? It is *seasonable* to preach against rebellion on the *fifth of November*; and is the same doctrine *unseasonable* on the *thirtieth of January*? are treasons and bloodshed things of so indifferent a nature, that we ought not rashly to censure them who spend this day in revelling and feasting, but charitably to suppose that “*he that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord, so he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it!*”

MISCELLANEOUS.

CONTINENTAL CHURCHES.

With Observations on the Romish Worship, and the State of Religion Abroad.

NO. XI.—THE ABBÉ HELSEN'S CHURCH AT BRUSSELS.

In pursuance of the object of these papers, which are intended in connexion with a description of the principal churches, to throw some light upon the state of religion on the continent, it will scarcely be deemed irrelevant to give a brief account of the reform which the Abbé Helsen is endeavouring to introduce into the worship and discipline of the Romish communion. There are some few more of the national churches of Belgium which still remain to be noticed, especially those of Ghent, Liege, and Tournay; but since the Abbé's name has more than once been mentioned of late in the pages of the *CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCE*, the interest which has been excited respecting him will be a sufficient reason to introduce him at once. A few years since he held a small benefice in the diocese of Malines, when some disagreement arose between the Archbishop and himself on the subject of certain abuses in the discipline of the church. The primary cause of dispute was the decided tone of reprobation in which the Abbé felt himself bound in conscience to denounce the gross immoralities practised by the Belgian clergy, and particularly the state of concubinage in which they notoriously indulged. It appears that in 1829, a young priest, living openly with his mistress, by whom he had several children, was reduced to a state of the most abject penury; and M. Helsen, having made him sensible of the ignominy of his conduct, undertook to interest M. Engelbert Sterckx, the present Archbishop of Malines, and at that time vicar-general of the diocese and dean of the cathedral, in his behalf. In the course of his interview with the dean, he was led to make some strong observations upon the scandal brought upon the church of Christ, by the licentious habits of the Romish clergy; whereat his superior evinced considerable impatience, and eventually interdicted the exercise of his clerical functions within the town of Brussels. Nothing daunted by these arbitrary measures, the Abbé devoted himself resolutely to the task of bringing about a reform in this and other abuses, which had already excited great disgust among the laity, and tended to bring religion itself into contempt in the person of its ministers. As the first

step towards this desirable object, he addressed a letter to the Pope, of which the following is a copy:—

Bruxellis, 22 Augusti, 1831.

BEATISSIME PATER,

Unde Agapeturum in ecclesiam introivit? exclamabat oīm Divus Hieronymus. Hodie in contemptum sacrorum canonicorum clerus hujus archidiocesis Mechlinensis, sub auspiciis dominorum vicariorum capitularium Forgeur et Sterckx, nec non præsidis seminarii P. E. Collier, impuræ infectus est non solum concubinatu vel publico vel palliato, sed et, saltem pars aliqua, &c. &c.* Haec omnia probare canonice sum paratus, si sanctitas sua dignetur depudare virum integrum. Profecto, cui congruentius exponerem hanc justam querelam, quam Petri successori, cui Dominus maximè commendavit invigilare non solum integritati fidei sed et morum puritati.

Humillimus famulus,

C. H. HELSEN, Presbyter Bruxellis.

No reply having been vouchsafed to this appeal, the Abbé, after a lapse of six months, again dispatched a verbatim copy of it, to which he made the subjoined addition:—

Alios abusus, quāmvis enormes, alto hic involvo silentio; ast has execrabilis præterice nequeo: tanti enim sunt, ut vindictam clament in eos. Et summis Pontifex tacet in terris! et grec Christi, ipso sciente, mactaretur, perdeatur! Absit; ne turpitudines publicentur.

Haec ultima mea hâc de re expostulatio: Sanctitas vestra certissima esse poterit, memetipsum illi tantum scripturum, dum cessabunt mala, vel debitis saltem desuper fiat informatio.

Sanctitatis vestrae humillimus famulus,

C. H. HELSEN, Presb. Bruxel.

Bruxellis, 22 Februarii, 1832.

Still no notice was taken of the matter; and on the 16th of June the Abbé addressed a long letter to M. Sterckx, who had now been raised to the archbishopric of Malines, with the ultimate intention of publication, unless measures were speedily adopted for the suppression of the vices of the clergy. Early in the following year, the new prelate condescended to reply, and moreover sent several priests to assure the Abbé of his esteem, and to convey his wish to have some conversation with him. About the same time, M. Helsen also received a visit from the Abbé Peurette, the proprietor of a journal called the Union, who intimated that the Archbishop was ready to restore his rights, which he acknowledged to have been unjustly withheld, and to augment his preferment, provided he refrained from publishing his letter; but threatening to write him down in his newspaper, if he ventured to attack the Papists. The compromise was indignantly rejected; the breach was now widened; the Abbé formally separated from the Romish church; and in justification of his secession, published, with some addition, the letter which he had addressed to the Archbishop, under the title of "Avis à l'Archevêque de Malines, Monseigneur Sterckx, sur les abus du célibat des Prêtres." It was reprinted in 1834, as the preliminary portion of a much more extended treatise on the subject of abuses in general, entitled, "Le Pape de Rome, et les Evêques de sa Communion, corrupteurs du Dogme et de la Morale de Jésus-Christ.

* The crime, here specified, is better omitted.

Second Avis à l'Archevêque de Malines, Engelbert Sterckx, par l'Abbé C. H. Helsen." This was succeeded by the "Traité très-curieux sur la Confession Auriculaire;" and the Abbé has been long occupied upon certain other works, illustrative of the principles upon which an acceptable worship should be founded. These are, 1. "Reforme Radicale de tous les cultes révélés." 2. "Esprit des lois religieuses," 3. "Le Contrat de Mariage." Their publication has been delayed partly by the author's distressing weakness of sight, and partly by some other circumstances dependent upon his peculiar situation.

The abuse of the Romish sacrament of auricular confession is another of the points at issue between the Abbé and the priests. It is urged in defence of this practice that it is a powerful instrument in the hands of the clergy for the detection of robbery and crime, for the consolation of the penitent, the conversion of the sinner, and the instruction of the ignorant. Granting that the service of the confessional has been occasionally the means of discovering a fraud or a theft, it is far from clear that it is a very frequent means of restitution; and numberless indeed are the instances in which absolution is purchased by a part of the spoil, and the remainder conscientiously appropriated by virtue of such composition. With respect to the other advantages of the rite, the Abbé justly remarks that the same ends are more effectually promoted by inculcating the duty of repentance, as a condition of salvation, and preaching the gospel of Christ, in its essence and purity. On the other hand, so far from affording consolation, the confessor not unusually loads the penitent with reproaches, and sends him away in despair; instead of converting the sinner, he offers enticement to sin, and by an artful interrogatory, suggests to the mind a catalogue of crimes of which it was previously unconscious. Under the mask of instruction he embues the youthful auditor with a spirit of intolerance and fanaticism, of which the hideous effects are sufficiently obvious in the assassinations, and murders, and massacres which pollute the history of Papal Rome. In his "Traité très-curieux," the Abbé adverts to the numerous cases of seduction in which the priests succeed by means of the confessional; while at the same time they confess to each other, and employ the rite as a cloak of sanctity. They use it moreover as a means of the grossest extortion; and, while the rich are received with a degree of consideration proportionate to their wealth, the lower classes are turned aside with rude indifference. "Pour moi," said an old priest to the Abbé with imperturbable gravity, "je rebute les pauvres qui ne me donnent rien : je caresse et je confesse les riches qui me procurent tout, et je m'en suis trouvé bien :" and another boasted that his confessional brought him an annual return of 50 louis. In order to secure this abundant harvest, the most oppressive and disgusting tyranny is adopted. The nuptial benediction and consolation at the dying bed are alike withheld from those who make their confessions to Almighty God instead of to their priests; nor are masses for the dead allowed to those who die unshriven.

It would not be fair that the higher dignitaries of the church should be excluded from all the nice pickings which result from this state of things; and accordingly the bishops usually reserve to themselves some ten or a dozen sins of a more flagrant character, from which none of the

inferior priesthood has the privilege to grant absolution. Among these special transgressions are included adultery, homicide, arson, and any wholesale massacre which it may be advisable to perpetrate for the extinction of heretics. In addition to these abominations there are also certain dues which the Holy See retains in its own hands. A few of the items from the Papal tariff, published by authority in France in 1691, and still in force, will be no less amusing than instructive. The debtor and creditor account between his Holiness, and a delinquent to any of the subjoined offences, would stand thus :—

	£
For absolution of the crime of apostasy.....	4
Absolution and dispensation for bigamy	1050
————— for heresy	80
————— murder	95
————— being accessory to a murder	85
Indulgences for seven years	12
Perpetual indulgences for a fraternity	40
Permission to read forbidden books	25
Dispensation for simony	40
Permission to eat flesh	65
Dispensation for vows of chastity	15
Declaration of nullity of a religious vow	100
The same after ten years of profession	200

To these were added a variety of other charges, having reference to the forging of wills, fratricide, seduction, rape, incest, perjury, infanticide, sacrilege, and sundry other enormities, for which absolution and indulgences may be obtained at moderate prices. Surely it may still be said of Papal, as it was formerly of Republican Rome, *Omnia veniam Romæ*. But of this there will be more to say, when we return to the Abbé Helsen in our next number.

REVIVAL OF CONVOCATION.

MR. EDITOR,—You have, on numerous occasions, powerfully pleaded for the revival of Convocation. There exists, I am persuaded, throughout the great body of the Clergy, the most anxious wish for its restoration; but owing to a variety of causes, they shrink from public manifestations of their opinion. As the measures of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners will probably be among the earliest submitted to Parliament; and as it is known that some of the Bishops, the Chapters, the Parochial Clergy, and the sound constitutional part of the laity, with very few exceptions, do not altogether approve of the intended plans; may I suggest that *now* or never seems to be the time for one grand simultaneous expression of opinion. Let the Clergy in every archdeaconry assemble, and in conjunction with the sound and respectable part of the laity, tell Parliament, that however submissive to the laws they themselves may be, they do not wish to see Parliament usurp the rights of Convocation; and that if bishoprics are to be suppressed, as in Ireland, or to be altered in their boundaries and jurisdictions, as in England; if chapters are to have their funds alienated, or their numbers curtailed, these are questions beyond the Royal autho-

rity, or the power of Parliament ; and that the Clergy do not feel that it is within the mere force of an act of Parliament to transfer their oath of canonical obedience from the sees to which they have sworn it, to sees created by the authority of a body composed like that of the House of Commons.

Not long since *The Times* newspaper called loudly for the rights of Convocation ; but then it was evidently wished for only as an instrument of annoyance to the Whigs. The probable accession of Sir. R. Peel to office at no distant period, has now changed their note, and they have denounced the proposed revival of Convocation as mischievous. Now this complete subjection of the interests of the Church to mere party measures, is what we ought especially to guard against ; and the late freaks of a Whig-radical government with the Church, and the bare possibility of its again, at some future time, falling into their unsafe keeping, are reasons sufficiently powerful, I trust, to unite all sound Churchmen in insisting on the only real safeguard against such dangers —the revival of the powers of Convocation, with such modifications only as the lapse of time may have rendered necessary.

January 26, 1837.

NOW OR NEVER.

CHURCH SOCIETIES.

MR. EDITOR.—Feeling the deep and daily increasing importance of the question of the Church Societies, I request leave to make a few further observations, in addition to those you were pleased to make public in your July number for 1836.

The objects of the societies are the most important, and the most deeply interesting that the christian mind can contemplate. Each society has noble designs—each society proposes to itself a specific line of duty—each society feels its want of means—each society, too, is compelled to restrain its benevolent desires, and confine its exertions within comparatively very narrow limits. Each society, moreover, stands in need of the support of the others, and the cause of each must advance or recede according as mutual support be given or withheld. The value of these our church institutions is very obvious, and the necessity of their conjoint exertion equally apparent ; for, beyond the influence of a private Christian's example—beyond the circle of his domestic and social connexion, he can, indeed, do little single-handed for the benefit of society. What, therefore, an individual cannot accomplish, a society may—what one society of itself cannot do, several unitedly may effect ; and in the case of the three principal Church Societies, one takes one department of christian labour, one another, and a third another, but not one can fulfil even its own specific design, without the simultaneous co-operation of the others. For, to what purpose do we provide schools for our children, and, by the distribution of our tracts, urge the duty and advantage of devout attendance upon the ordinances of God's house, if there be not also churches provided for them to worship in, and pastors upon whose authorized ministrations they may wait ? And to what purpose do we erect churches, if our

population be not anteriorly prepared to take part in the sacred service, and to pray in understanding as well as in spirit? And again, how feebly and inadequately shall we fulfil the great duty of propagating the Gospel in foreign parts, if we be not fully and gratefully sensible of its value at home, or if the unchristian lives of any of our emigrants be suffered to counteract the zealous efforts of our missionaries! Or how, again, shall the missionary teach an ignorant and superstitious tribe the elements of gospel truth, if we send him not Bibles and suitable books of instruction? The same necessity, therefore, that pleads for one society, pleads for all—pleads for them severally, and pleads for them jointly. And as there is an intimate and indispensable connexion between the various means of grace, and the exemplification of Christianity in individual Christians; so also in christian communities, the very same means must be employed for perfecting the christian body. For, let any sober-minded and devout Christian but call to mind the process by which the "kingdom of God" has been set up within him,—he will be the readiest to acknowledge, that "by the grace of God he is what he is;" but he will not fail to remember, that that grace has been imparted to him by *means*—by means of a christian education—by means of prayer—by means of meditation upon the word and dispensations of God—by means of God's ministers—and by means of attendance upon the ordinances of his Church. Let him then consider, that ordinarily his fellow-members in the christian family have to advance towards christian perfection by the *same process*, and that, therefore, the same means of grace are as indispensable in their case as in his own. Let him consider further, that the christian church is the "light of the world," and that it has to illuminate the dark places of the earth with the rays of the gospel; and let him, with deep feelings of gratitude, also reflect that Britain herself was once a heathen land, and that she has gradually emerged from the darkest estate of heathenism, by the influence of the same means of grace that are necessary for the advancement of an individual Christian. Such considerations will serve to show the connexion of the Church Societies one with another, and with their common end; and furnish withal a strong argument for their joint as well as their separate support; for it is not singly, but collectively—not by one means of grace, but by many—not by the efforts of one society, but by the exertions of all conjointly, that their common object can be attained.

And we may urge further, that the giving full and cordial support to the Societies in question, and thereby enabling them severally and collectively to prosecute their good designs, would act as a legitimate and powerful corrective of various false principles, which different classes of professing Christians have in modern times recognized. We have had too much reason to complain, that *some one* particular object of christian charity has been pursued with more or less ardour, to the disparagement of other objects equally, if not more important. Thus one class of persons, in industriously supporting missionary societies, seem to have overlooked the claims of their spiritually-destitute brethren at home, who should primarily have been regarded. Another class, exceedingly anxious to circulate the Bible, have given weight and currency to the unsound notion, that "the Scriptures by themselves are

an adequate guide to eternal life, and that by putting the Bible into a man's hand, we furnish him with all that is needful to salvation." And another class, if they have not altogether overlooked the claims of our colonies and of the heathen, have yet set forth those claims feebly and inadequately, from a conviction of the paramount claims of our own countrymen around us, but to whose spiritual necessities they were unable fully to minister, because they wanted the cooperation of those who were spending their zeal in other directions. Thus, schisms and errors have been extensively multiplied amongst us, and even the "*increase of Popery in our land may be traced to a falling off from the principle of unity in our Church.*" And herein we are all more or less "verily guilty;" for if we have not directly encouraged, we have at least indirectly countenanced the proceedings alluded to; and though we may have *demonstrated* the unsoundness of their principle, we have not been sufficiently earnest in *practically* counteracting their effects. I trust, however, we are now coming to a better mind; and I feel a strong conviction, that under God's blessing our Church Societies may be made the happy means of conducting us into it. For, let it be well considered, that it is peculiarly characteristic of the societies, that they act not in independence of, but in affectionate submission to the apostolic Church of England, out of whose bosom, as occasion required, they have at different periods arisen; and that their main object is, to subserve her honest purposes of making men, "not almost, but altogether Christians," and of doing her part towards filling the world with such. *end*

I have not time now (neither, Mr. Editor, could I ask space) to press the argument further; but the practical inference I wish your readers to draw from my observations, is this: namely, that as the efforts of each society are loudly called for, so also the **SIMULTANEOUS COOPERATION OF ALL** is no less urgently demanded; and therefore, that district committees of all three societies should be immediately and generally set on foot. It is quite a mistake (and a very hurtful one) to suppose, that people cannot afford to contribute to more than one society. Let, therefore, the claims of *all* be prominently set forth, and each Christian be made sensible that, whilst nothing is expected *beyond* his means, the laws of the Gospel require him to contribute *according* to his means. Let there be opportunities afforded him of throwing into the treasury of the Church, that which his conscience shall tell him he ought to contribute; and whether his offering be a mite or a talent, it will be accepted according to what he has, and not according to what he has not. Let the Clergy set apart one or two Sundays every year, for the purpose of recommending the societies to the support of their parishioners; and let the money which may be collected, be divided equally amongst the local societies of the respective places. With respect to district associations for promoting the building of churches, I would suggest, that the amounts raised be added to the funds of the Church-Building Society, for the *particular diocese* in which the district lies. And especially as regards the diocese of London, I am exceedingly anxious that the diocesan should be enabled to execute to the full his noble designs; and as the London Committee, "recommend the formation of local committees for the purpose of soliciting subscriptions;" I hope to see efficient ones established, and the Clergy preach-

ing collection sermons for the common benefit of the "Churches' fund," and of the Societies for promoting Christian Knowledge and propagating the Gospel; for let it ever be remembered, that whilst each distinct society has its own peculiar offices to fulfil, the *aggregate* of their respective offices is necessary for the completion of the christian character. Nor let it be forgotten, that the highest aim of the societies is to place individuals and communities fairly under the maternal superintendence of the Church of England, and to leave them in her hands, who is both authorized and competent to minister to their spiritual necessities. In short, we must bear in mind and continually act upon the principle, that arduous as may be their labours, the proper character of the societies is simply that of *schoolmasters* for bringing men into the *Church*, and that it is the province of the *CHURCH* to bring them unto Christ.

And whilst we believe our venerable Church to be a faithful witness of the truth, and labour, by the agency of her societies, to extend more and more her salutary influence, let us fervently pray unto Almighty God, in public and in private, to "pour down upon her the continual dew of his blessing," and to give especially unto "those ordained to any holy function, his grace and heavenly benediction." Let us pray to him to show her his work, and to prosper it in her hands; and whilst we wait for his loving kindness in the midst of his temple, and hear there "what he has done in time of old," let us neither hide it from the people of our own times, nor from the children of the generations to come; nor fail *ourselves* to derive comfort and confidence from the animating assurance, that "the same God is our God for ever and ever, and will be our guide unto death."

Again entreating the attention of yourself and your readers to the subject of this communication, I remain, Mr. Editor, very faithfully yours,

X.

ACTS FOR THE REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES.

Notice furnished by the Registrar-General, under the Provisions of the Act for Registering Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England.

ACTS required to be done by persons who may be desirous of solemnizing marriage after the 1st day of March, 1837, under the provisions of the Acts of the 6th and 7th of William IV, cap. 85 and 86.

1. Persons desirous of solemnizing marriage according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, may be so married after publication of bans, or by licence, or by special licence, as heretofore; or they may be married (without publication of bans, or by licence, or special licence,) according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, on production of a certificate from the superintendent-registrar of the district, to be obtained in the following manner, namely:—

One of the parties intending marriage must give notice, under his or her hand, to the superintendent-registrar of the district within which the parties shall have dwelt for not less than seven days then next preceding; or, if they dwell in different districts, they must give the like notice to the superintendent-registrar of each district. The notice must be in the form of a schedule, which the superintendent-registrar will furnish on being applied to, and must be filled up with the following particulars:—The name and surname of each of the parties; whether bachelor or widower, spinster or widow; their respective rank, profession, or calling; whether minors or of full age; their respective dwelling places;

whether they have resided within the district more than one calendar month, or if not, how long; in what church or building the marriage is to be solemnized; the district and county in which the other party resides, when they dwell in different districts. A copy of such notice will be entered by the superintendent-registrar in a book, called "The Marriage Notice Book," which will be open at all reasonable times, without fee, to all persons desirous of inspecting the same.

The notice must be read by the superintendent-registrar, or by the clerk to the guardians, at three weekly meetings of the guardians; or, if such meetings are not held weekly, at any meeting of the guardians within 21 days from the day of the notice being entered in the marriage notice book. And after the expiration of 21 days after the entry of the notice, if no impediment has been shown, the superintendent-registrar may be required to issue a certificate.

2. Persons (except Quakers and Jews) desirous of solemnizing marriage not according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, may be married according to other rites and ceremonies, on production of a certificate obtained as above mentioned, *in a registered place of worship*, provided that every such marriage shall be solemnized with open doors, between the hours of 8 and 12 in the forenoon, in the presence of some registrar of the district in which such registered building is situate, and of two or more credible witnesses; provided also, that in some part of the ceremony, and in the presence of such registrar and witnesses, each of the parties shall declare as follows:—

"I do solemnly declare that I know not of any lawful impediment why I, A. B., may not be joined in matrimony to C. D."

And each of the parties shall say to the other.—

"I call upon these persons here present to witness that I, A. B., do take thee, C. D., to be my lawful wedded (wife or husband)."

Provided also, that there be no lawful impediment to the marriage of such parties.

Persons may be married after seven days from the entry of the notice, if by licence, and after twenty-one days, if without licence. A licence may be granted by the superintendent-registrar, but only for marriage in a registered building within his district or in his office; but before any licence can be granted by him, one of the parties intending marriage must appear personally before him, and in case he shall not be the superintendent-registrar to whom notice of such intended marriage was given, shall deliver to him the certificate of the superintendent-registrar, or superintendent-registrars, to whom such notice shall have been given; and such party shall make oath, or shall make his or her solemn affirmation or declaration, instead of taking an oath, that he or she believeth that there is not any impediment of kindred or alliance, or other lawful hindrance to the said marriage, and that one of the said parties hath for the space of fifteen days immediately before the day of the grant of such licence, had his or her usual place of abode within the district within which such marriage is to be solemnized; and where either of the parties (not being a widower or widow) shall be under the age of 21 years, that the consent of the person or persons whose consent to such marriage is required by law has been obtained thereto, or that there is no person having authority to give such consent, as the case may be.

3. Persons objecting to be married either according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, or in any such registered building, may, after notice and certificate as aforesaid, solemnize marriage at the office of the superintendent-registrar, with open doors, between the hours of 8 and 12 in the forenoon, in the presence of the superintendent-registrar and some registrar of the district, and in the presence of two witnesses, making the declaration and using the form of words required in the case of marriage in a registered building.

Quakers may contract and solemnize marriage according to the usages of their Society, provided both parties are of that Society, and that notice shall have been given to the superintendent-registrar, and a certificate shall have been issued as before mentioned.

Jews may likewise contract and solemnize marriage according to the usages of the Jewish religion, under similar provisions.

Every marriage of which notice has been entered as aforesaid, must be solemnized within three calendar months after such entry, or the notice must be renewed.

Every marriage solemnized after March 1, 1837, under the provisions of this

Act for Marriages in England, in any other manner than as hereinbefore directed, will be null and void.

Be it also particularly observed, that if any valid marriage shall be had under the provisions of the Act for Marriages in England, by means of any wilfully false notice, certificate, or declaration, made by either party to such marriage, as to any matter to which a notice, certificate, or declaration is therein required, his Majesty's Attorney-General or Solicitor-General may sue for a forfeiture of all estates and interest in any property accruing to the offending party by such marriage; and the proceedings and the consequences will be the same as are provided in the like case with regard to marriages by licence before the passing of these Acts.

Acts required to be done after the 1st day of March, 1837, in all cases of Birth.

The father or mother of any child born after the 1st day of March, 1837, or the occupier* of any house or tenement in which any such birth shall happen, may give notice of such birth to the registrar of the district in which the birth happens, within *forty-two days* next after the day of such birth: and the father or mother, or (in case of their death, illness, absence, or inability) the occupier of the house or tenement, *must*, within the said *forty-two days*, give information to the registrar, on being requested to do so, according to the best of his or her knowledge and belief of the following particulars, namely:—The day of the birth of the child; the name (if any is given); the sex; the name and surname of the father; the name and maiden surname of the mother; the rank, profession, trade, or calling of the father.

The person giving such information must also state and sign in the register his or her name, description, and residence; and unless this be done, no register can be given in evidence. *No fee or payment can be lawfully required of the person giving information respecting any birth:* and the entry in the register, which the registrar will thereupon be obliged to make, being signed as aforesaid, will be evidence of such birth in any court of law or equity.

No birth may be registered *after forty-two days* from the time of such birth, unless the father or guardian of the child, or some person present at the birth, make a solemn declaration of the foregoing particulars, according to the best of his or her knowledge and belief; and the registrar shall register the birth accordingly, in the presence of the superintendent-registrar; and the person requiring the birth to be so registered shall pay to the superintendent-registrar two shillings and sixpence, and to the registrar (unless the delay should have been occasioned by his default) five shillings.

No person shall knowingly cause any birth to be registered otherwise than as hereinbefore mentioned, after forty-two days, under a penalty of fifty pounds; and no person shall knowingly cause any birth to be registered at all after six calendar months from after the day of birth, (except in the case of children born at sea,) under the like penalty.

No register of births made after six calendar months from the day of birth (except in the case of children born at sea) will be received as legal evidence in any court of law or equity.

Acts required to be done after the 1st day of March, 1837, in all cases of Death.

Some person present at a death, or in attendance during the last illness, or (in case of the inability of such person) the occupier,* or (if the occupier be the person that has died) some inmate of the house or tenement in which a death shall have happened, may, within five days after the death, give notice thereof to the registrar of the district, and *must* within *eight days* give information to the said registrar, on being requested to do so, according to the best of his or her knowledge or belief, of the following particulars; namely:—

The day of death; the name and surname of the person who has died; the sex; the age; the rank, profession, trade, or calling; the cause of death.

The person giving information must also state and sign in the register his or

* For the purposes of this Act, the master or keeper of every gaol, prison, or house of correction, or workhouse, hospital, or lunatic asylum, or public or charitable institution, shall be deemed the occupier thereof.

her name, description, and residence ; and unless this be done, no register can be given in evidence. *No fee or payment can be lawfully required of the person so giving information respecting any death ; and the entry in the register, which the registrar will thereupon be obliged to make, being signed as aforesaid, will be evidence of such death in any court of law or equity.*

Every person who shall bury or perform any funeral or any religious service for the burial of any dead body, for which *no certificate* shall have been made and delivered either by the registrar or (in case of inquest) by the Coroner, and who shall not within seven days give notice thereof to the registrar, will forfeit *ten pounds*. And no certificate can be given (except by the Coroner when an inquest has been held) unless the death has been registered by the registrar of the district. *It is, therefore, of the greatest importance* that persons directed as above, shall *without delay* give *information* respecting a death to the registrar of the district within which the death has taken place, that he may register the same, and thereupon deliver a certificate to the undertaker, or other person having charge of the funeral.

CAUTION.—Every person wilfully making or causing to be made any *false statement* touching any of the particulars required to be known and registered, for the purpose of such statement being inserted in any register of birth, death, or marriage, will be subject to the same pains and penalties as if guilty of *perjury*.

N. B. Persons failing to do that which is by an Act of Parliament enjoined, are indictable for a misdemeanour, although no specific penalty is imposed by the Act which they have so disobeyed.

AN UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

(COPY.)

Whitehall, Dec. 1, 1836.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to transmit to your Lordship the charter of the University of London.

His Majesty has been pleased to approve of the appointment of your Lordship as Chancellor, and of Mr. Lubbock as the first Vice-Chancellor of the University.

I feel confident that it is not necessary to recommend to your Lordship either a zealous attention to the interests of learning, or a constant regard to those principles of religious freedom, which have furnished motives for the Royal grant.

I have no less reliance on the distinguished men who are associated with yourself and Mr. Lubbock in the government of the University.

You may be assured that on my part also I shall esteem it an honour to cooperate in the advancement of an institution destined to confer the distinctions justly due to proficiency in literature, science, or art, without imposing a test of religious opinions, or binding by the fetters of the 17th century the talent and merit of the present enlightened age.

I have the honour to be, my Lord, your obedient humble servant,

(Signed) J. RUSSELL.

The Earl of Burlington, &c.

(COPY.)

Compton-place, Dec. 9, 1836.

MY LORD,—I have had the honour to receive your letter, informing me of his Majesty's approbation of my appointment as Chancellor of the University of London. I am fully aware of the important duties confided to me, and the distinguished men with whom I have the honour to be associated in the government of the University; and you may be assured I shall have a constant regard to those principles of religious freedom to which you have particularly directed my attention.

I have, &c.
(Signed) BURLINGTON.

William the Fourth, by the grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland King, Defender of the Faith, to all whom these presents shall come, greeting: Whereas, we have deemed it to be the duty of our Royal office, for the advancement of religion and morality and the promotion of useful knowledge, to hold forth to all classes and denominations of our faithful subjects, without any distinction whatsoever, an encouragement for pursuing a regular

and liberal course of education; and considering that many persons do prosecute or complete their studies, both in the metropolis and in other parts of our United Kingdom, to whom it is expedient that there should be offered such facilities, and on whom it is just that there should be conferred such distinctions and rewards as may incline them to persevere in these their laudable pursuits; Now know ye, that for the purpose of ascertaining, by means of examination, the persons who have acquired proficency in literature, science, and art, by the pursuit of such course of education, and of the rewarding them by academical degrees, as evidence of their respective attainments, and marks of honour proportioned thereto, we do, by virtue of our prerogative Royal, and of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, by these presents, for us, our heirs, and successors, will, grant, declare and constitute,

Our right trusty and well-beloved cousin, William Cavendish, Earl of Burlington,

The Right Rev. Father in God Edward Lord Bishop of Durham,

The Right Rev. Father in God William Lord Bishop of Chichester,

Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Henry Baron Brougham and Vaux, and

Our trusty and well-beloved George Riddel Airy, Esq. our Astronomer Royal, and Fellow of the Royal Society,

Andrew Amos, Esq. Barrister-at-law,

Thomas Arnold, Doctor in Divinity,

John Austin, Esq. Barrister-at-Law,

Neil Arnott, Esq. Doctor in Medicine,

John Bacot, Esq.

Francis Beaufort, Esq. Captain in our Royal Navy, Hydrographer of the Admiralty, and Fellow of the Royal Society,

Archibald Billing, Esq. Doctor in Medicine, and Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians,

William Thomas Brande, Esq. Vice-President of the Royal Society,

James Clarke, Esq. Doctor in Medicine, Fellow of the College of Physicians, and of the Royal Society,

Philip Cecil Crampton, Esq. Doctor in Civil Law, Fellow of the Royal Society, and our Surgeon-General in Ireland,

John Dalton, Esq. Doctor of Civil Law, and Fellow of the Royal Society, William Empson, Esq. Barrister-at-Law, Professor of General Polity and the Laws of England at the East-India College,

Michael Faraday, Esq. Doctor of Civil Law, Fellow of the Royal Society,

Sir Stephen Love Hammick, Bart. Doctor in Medicine, Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, and Fellow of the Royal Society,

John Stevens Henslow, Clerk, Master of Arts, Professor of Botany in the University of Cambridge,

Cornelius Hewett, Esq. Doctor in Medicine, and Downing Professor of Medicine in the University of Cambridge,

Thomas Hodgkin, Esq. Doctor in Medicine,

Francis Kierman, Esq.

John George Shaw Lefevre, Esq. Fellow of the Royal Society,

John Wm. Lubbock, Esq. Vice-President and Treasurer of the Royal Society, Sir James M'Grigor, Baronet, Doctor in Medicine, Doctor of Civil Law,

Fellow of the Royal Society, Fellow of the College of Physicians, one of our Physicians Extraordinary, and Director-General of the Army Medical Board,

Richard Rainy Pennington, Esq.

Jones Quain, Esq. Doctor in Medicine,

John Rideout, Esq.

Peter Mark Roget, Esq. Doctor in Medicine, Secretary of the Royal Society, Nassau William Senior, Esq. one of the Masters of our High Court of Chancery, and Fellow of the Royal Society,

Joseph Henry Gerrard, Doctor of Laws, Principal of the Bristol College,

Richard Sheepshanks, Clerk, Fellow of the Royal Society,

John Sims, Esq. Doctor in Medicine,

Connop Thirlwall, Clerk, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge,

James Walker, Esq. Fellow of the Royal Society, and

Henry Warburton, Esq. Member of the Commons House of Parliament, and Fellow of the Royal Society,

during our Royal will and pleasure, and all persons whom we may hereafter appoint to be Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, or Fellows, as hereinafter mentioned, one body politic and corporate, by the name of the University of London, by which name such body politic shall have perpetual succession, and shall have a common seal, and shall by the same name sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, and answer and be answered unto in every Court of us, our heirs, and successors. And we do hereby will and ordain, that by the same name they and their successors shall be able and capable in law to take, purchase, and hold to them and their successors any goods, chattels, or personal property whatsoever; and shall also be able and capable in law, notwithstanding the statutes of mortmain, to take, purchase, and hold to them and their successors, not only all such lands, buildings, hereditaments, and possessions, as may be from time to time exclusively used and occupied for the immediate purposes of the said University, but also any other lands, buildings, hereditaments, and possessions whatsoever, situate within our United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, not exceeding the annual value of 10,000*l*; such annual value to be calculated and ascertained at the period of taking, purchasing, or acquiring the same; and that they and their successors shall be able and capable in law to grant, demise, alien, or otherwise dispose of all or any of the property, real or personal, belonging to the said University; and also to do all other matters incidental or appertaining to a body corporate. And we do hereby further will and ordain that the said body politic and corporate shall consist of a Chancellor, one Vice-Chancellor, and such number of Fellows or Members of the Senate as we shall from time to time appoint under our sign manual; and that our right trusty and right well-beloved cousin the aforesaid William Cavendish Earl of Burlington be the first Chancellor, John William Lubbock, Esq. the Vice-Chancellor, and the aforesaid Edward Lord Bishop of Durham, William Lord Bishop of Chichester, Henry Baron Brougham and Vaux, George Biddel Airy, Andrew Amos, Thomas Arnold, John Austin, Neil Arnott, John Bacon, Francis Beaumont, Archibald Billing, William Thomas Brande, James Clarke, Philip Cecil Crampton, John Dalton, William Empson, Michael Farady, Sir Stephen Love Hammick, John Stevens Henslow, Cornelius Hewett, Thomas Hodgkin, Francis Kiernan, John George Shaw Lefevre, John William Lubbock, Sir James McGrigor, Richard Rainy Pennington, Jones Quain, John Rideout, Peter Mark Roget, Nassau William Senior, Joseph Henry Jerrard, Richard Sheepshanks, John Sims, Connop Thirlwall, James Walker, and Henry Warburton, be the first Fellows and Members of the Senate thereof. That whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of Chancellor of the said University, either by death, resignation, or otherwise, we will, under our sign manual, nominate a fit and proper person to be the Chancellor, instead of the Chancellor occasioning such vacancy. That the office of Vice-Chancellor of the said University shall be an annual office; and the Vice-Chancellor hereinbefore named shall, at the expiration of one year from the 1st of July, 1837, go out of office, and the said Fellows or Members of the Senate shall, at the meeting to be holden by them for that purpose, on some day within a month before the expiration of the tenure of the said office, of which due notice shall be given, elect one other fit and proper person to be the Vice-Chancellor of the said University, and so from time to time annually; or, in case of the death, resignation, or other avoidance of such Vice-Chancellor, before the expiration of his year of office, shall, at a meeting to be holden by them for that purpose as soon as conveniently may be, of which due notice shall be given, elect some other fit and proper person to be Vice-Chancellor for the remainder of the year in which such death, resignation, or other avoidance shall happen; such person to be chosen from among themselves by the major part of the Fellows present at such meeting, and to be approved of by the Chancellor of the said University for the time being.

That we reserve to ourselves to be the Visitor of the said University of London, with authority to do all things which pertain to Visitors, as often as to us shall seem meet.

That the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows for the time being, shall have the entire management of, and superintendence over the affairs, concerns, and property of the said University; and in all cases unprovided for by this our charter, it shall be lawful for the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, to act in such manner as shall appear to them best calculated to promote the purposes intended by the said University; and the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor,

and Fellows, shall have full power from time to time to make, and also to alter any by-laws and regulations (so as the same be not repugnant to the laws of our realm, or to the general objects and provisions of this our charter) touching the examinations for degrees, and the granting of the same, and touching the mode and time of convening the meetings of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, and in general, touching all other matters whatsoever regarding the said University; and all such by-laws and regulations, when reduced into writing, and after the common seal of the said University shall have been affixed thereto, shall be binding upon all persons members thereof, and all candidates for degrees to be conferred by the same, all such by-laws and regulations having been first submitted to one of our principal Secretaries of State, and approved of and countersigned by him.

That all questions which shall come before the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, shall be decided by a majority of the members present; and the chairman at any such meeting shall have a vote, and in case of an equality of votes, a second or casting vote.

That no question, shall be decided at any meeting unless the Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor, and five Fellows, or, in the absence of the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor, unless six Fellows at the least shall be present at the time of such decision.

That, at every meeting of the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, the Chancellor, or in his absence the Vice-Chancellor, shall preside as chairman; or in the absence of both, a chairman shall be chosen by the members present, or the major part of them.

That the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, for the time being, shall have full power from time to time to appoint, and, as they shall see occasion, to remove all examiners, officers, and said servants of the said University.

That once, at least, in every year, the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, shall cause to be held an examination of candidates for degrees; and on every such examination, the candidates shall be examined either by examiners appointed for the purpose from among the Fellows by the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, or by other examiners so to be appointed; and that on every such examination the candidates shall be examined in as many branches of general knowledge as the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows shall consider the most fitting subjects of such examination. And whereas it is expedient to extend the benefits of colleges, and establishments already instituted, or which may be hereafter instituted, for the promotion of literature, science, and art, whether incorporated or not incorporated, by connecting them for such purposes with the University created by this our Royal charter—We do hereby further will and ordain, that all persons shall be admitted as candidates for the respective degrees of Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, Bachelor of Laws, or Doctor of Laws, to be conferred by the said University of London, on presenting to the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, a certificate from any of the institutions hereinafter mentioned, to the effect that such candidate has completed the course of instruction which the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows by regulation in that behalf shall determine.

That such certificates as aforesaid may be granted from our college called

University College, or from our College called King's College, both situated in London, or from such other institution, corporate or unincorporate, as now is, or hereafter shall be, established for the purposes of education, whether in the metropolis or elsewhere within our United Kingdom, and as we, under our sign manual, shall hereafter authorize to issue such certificates.

And for the purpose of granting the degrees of Bachelor of Medicine, and Doctor of Medicine, and for the improvement of medical education in all its branches, as well in medicine as in surgery, midwifery, and pharmacy; We do further hereby will and ordain that the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, shall from time to time report to one of the principal Secretaries of State, what appear to them to be the medical institutions and schools, whether corporate or unincorporated in this our metropolis, or in other parts of our United Kingdom, from which either singly or jointly with other medical institutions and schools in the country or in foreign parts it may be fit and expedient in the judgment of the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, to admit candidates for medical degrees; and on approval of such report by our said Secretary of State, shall admit all persons as candidates for the respective

degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Doctor of Medicine, to be conferred by the said University, on presenting to the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, a certificate from any such institution or school, to the effect that such candidate has completed the course of instruction which the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, from time to time shall direct, with the approval of one of our principal Secretaries of State, to vary, alter and amend any such reports, by striking out any of the said institutions or schools included therein, or by adding others thereunto.

That the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, shall have power, after examination, to confer the several degrees of Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, Bachelor of Laws, Doctor of Laws, Bachelor of Medicine, Doctor of Medicine, and to examine for medical degrees in the four branches of medicine, surgery, midwifery, and pharmacy, and that such reasonable fees shall be charged for the degrees so conferred as the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, with the approbation of the Commissioners of our Treasury, shall from time to time direct; and such fees shall be carried to one general fee fund for the payment of the expenses of the said University, under the directions and regulations of the Commissioners of our Treasury, to whom the accounts of income, and expenditure of the said University shall once in every year be submitted, which accounts shall be subject to such examination and audit as the said Commissioners may direct.

That at the conclusion of every examination of the candidates, the examiners shall declare the name of every candidate whom they shall have deemed to be entitled to any of said degrees, and the departments of knowledge in which his proficiency shall have been evinced, and also his proficiency in relation to that of other candidates; and he shall receive from the said Chancellor a certificate, under the seal of the said University of London, and signed by the said Chancellor, in which the particulars so declared shall be stated,

Provided always, that all by-laws and regulations made from time to time touching the examination of candidates, and granting of degrees, shall be submitted for the consideration of one of our principal Secretaries of State, to be approved of by him.

And lastly, we do hereby for us, our heirs, and successors, grant and declare that these our letters patent, or the enrolment or exemplification thereof, shall be in and by all things valid and effectual in law, according to the true intent and meaning of the same, and shall be construed and adjudged in the most favourable and beneficial sense for the best advantage of the said University, as well in all courts as elsewhere, notwithstanding any nonrecital, misrecital, uncertainty, or imperfection, in these our letters patent.

In witness whereof, we have caused these our letters to be made patent. Witness ourself, at our Palace of Westminster the 28th day of November, in the seventh year of our reign.

(By writ of Privy Seal,) EDMUND.

POLITICAL RETROSPECT.

DOMESTIC.—During the last few weeks, the cause of Conservatism has gained an immense accession of strength. The election of Sir R. Peel to be Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow, which had hitherto been regarded as a situation to be filled only by Whigs and *Liberals*, has afforded an undoubted proof of *reaction* in Scotland; but the splendid entertainment which succeeded, and at which the manly declaration of Sir R. Peel,

that he would stand by the great institutions in Church and State in all their integrity, was received with an enthusiasm and perfect unanimity quite beyond all powers of description, must be an evidence quite irresistible, if any evidence can be supposed able to convince those who have made up their minds to be unconvinced. Even a year ago, we believe it would have been impossible, north of the Tweed, to have collected such a meeting for such a

purpose; and, when we bear in mind how far gone in Liberalism Scotland has shown herself since the Reform Bill, we regard this whole affair of Glasgow as nothing less than a public and solemn recantation of her past opinions, and one of the greatest triumphs of sound principles. We look forward with hope to the approaching Session of Parliament, fully convinced that nothing can long withstand the united hosts of the Conservatives, and the zeal, talents, sound knowledge, and exalted character of the leaders and directors of that powerful party.

The past month has been marked by the prevalence of a disease, supposed to originate in the great change which has taken place in the weather. The snow had been so deep as for several days to cause a complete stoppage of all communication between London and the counties, and very numerous and distressing casualties occurred in consequence; the breaking up of this weather has been accompanied by the prevalence of *influenza* to a most alarming extent, and has proved very fatal, the numerous deaths having almost recalled back to memory the times of the plague. So universally has the disease prevailed, that the public offices, as well as private establishments, were compelled in numerous instances to suspend business.

FRANCE.—Many untoward events every now and then happen in France, as if to remind Louis Philippe that his throne is not exactly a bed of roses. The recent attempt of Meunier at assassinating the king has been followed by numerous arrests of suspected individuals, although it seems doubtful whether they were in consequence of any revelations made by the assassin. The prisoners who were compromised with the nephew of Napoleon Buonaparte, in the late foolish attempt at Strasburg, have just been acquitted by the jury; and this is threatened to be followed up by laws of a still more stringent character. The government is also said to be, at length, in full pos-

session of all the schemes of revolution and plots existing in the army; and Marshal Soult is expected to join the Ministry, with a view to reform the army, and reduce it once more under the iron yoke of military discipline and subordination. The Ministry, therefore, with some slight modifications, will undoubtedly retain office; and the hopes of M. Thiers, and the Liberals of all shades and colours, seem doomed to lasting disappointment. One thing is evident, that the French King and his Ministers have virtually given up Lord Palmerston and the quadruple treaty, and will leave Spain to settle her own affairs without French intervention.

SPAIN.—The Carlists have been defeated before Bilboa by Espartero; and at length there seems some prospect of activity on the part of the Queen's armies. An imposing force is assembling to attack them in their strongholds; but so utterly unintelligible at the present moment is the whole state of the Peninsula, that we forbear to hazard an opinion as to the future prospects of these wretched countries; they are draining the very dregs of that cup of misery which centuries of civil and religious tyranny, of Popery and the reign of the Inquisition, have prepared for them. A fresh and more rigid ordinance has been issued for the total suppression of the religious orders; and, no doubt, there will be abundant alacrity in the Spanish Liberals to execute it to its fullest extent. We have said above, the whole state of the Peninsula is *unintelligible*: we may repeat the word in respect of Lord Palmerston's policy towards that country. If to be utterly unintelligible is a mark of profundity, then our Foreign Secretary's policy is the very height, or rather *depth*, of wisdom. We are not at war with Don Carlos; and yet English troops and seamen have been smuggled out of the country to aid his opponents; and their late victory was mainly secured by such cooperation.

UNIVERSITY, ECCLESIASTICAL, AND PAROCHIAL INTELLIGENCE.

TRIBUTES OF RESPECT.

THE REV. H. P. COOKESLEY.—The pupils of St Peter's Grammar School, Eaton-square, Pimlico, have presented an elegant coffee service of plate to the Rev. H. P. Cookesley, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, on the occasion of his retirement from the Head Mastership of that Institution.

THE REV. J. EAST.—The consecration of the new church of St. Michael's, Bath, lately took place; the ceremonial being performed by the Lord Bishop of the Diocese. Immediately after the morning service, and before the Lord Bishop left the church, several of the congregation of St. Michael belonging to the working classes, presented the Rev. John East with a silver salver, bearing the following inscription:—“And the Lord said unto him, I have heard thy prayer and thy supplication that thou hast made before me: I have hallowed this house which thou hast built, to put my name there for ever: and mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually.”—1 Kings ix. 3.

“This small tribute of respect is most humbly and gratefully
presented to the

REVEREND JOHN EAST, M.A.,

by a few of the industrious Class of the Congregation of St. Michael's, Bath, in token of their affectionate love and regard for him, as a faithful and zealous Ambassador of Christ, and with a fervent prayer that the Lord may long continue him as their much beloved pastor.—Jan. 4, 1837, the day of Consecration of the New Parish Church.” The collection of the day amounted to 230*l.*

REV. H. MADGE.—A splendid tea-service of plate has been presented to the Rev. H. Madge, Curate of Rothley, by his parishioners. In times like these, it is particularly gratifying to learn that all classes and persuasions cordially united in offering a testimony of their respect to the Clergyman who had resided upwards of nine years amongst them. We understand they have also determined to remove his furniture free of cost, to his new residence at Kettering, Northamptonshire.

CONSECRATION FEES.

Great Dean's-yard, Westminster, 30th December, 1836.

SIR,—A paragraph has appeared in several of the newspapers in which it is imputed to the Bishop of London, as his motive in urging the erection of additional churches in the Metropolis, the desire of securing to himself certain fees to be received by him, as Bishop of the diocese, for the consecration of such churches. And, in the *Examiner* of the 4th ult. was inserted a letter, signed *Vigil*, stating that the Archbishop of Canterbury had refused to consecrate the church lately erected at Herne Bay, in Kent, until payment was made to him of 500*l.*, and the power of appointing the minister should be conceded to him. Having had the honour to act as Secretary to the above-named Prelates from the time of their respective promotions, I know most certainly that the imputation and statement referred to, are altogether unfounded in fact, and that neither the Archbishop of Canterbury, nor the Bishop of London, has ever directly or indirectly, demanded or received any fee, or other benefit or advantage whatsoever, by reason of the consecration of any church, chapel, or burial-ground; which solemnity, indeed, instead of being a source of profit to either of them, obliges them, on the contrary, to incur, in almost every case, a considerable expense. With respect to the consecration of the new church at Herne Bay, I know that the Archbishop of Canterbury has been, and is ready to consecrate it, on the completion of the legal formalities necessary for that purpose, and of course, without any condition to his own advantage.

I purposely avoid making any reflection on the tendency of the publications made in those papers, my only object being to exhibit the truth.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,
CHRISTOPHER HODGSON.

ST. BRIDE'S, FLEET-STREET.—Amongst the good signs of truly christian spirit is the state of the Metropolitan Church Fund, which the benevolence of individuals has raised to more than 100,000*l.*! Besides the sum just mentioned, there have been three new sites for churches or chapels in the metropolis given by various proprietors; one of these is bestowed by the Worshipful the Goldsmiths' Company to the parish of St. Bride. The plot of ground is in the immediate vicinity of New-street-square, at the east side of Fetter-lane; this ground has actually been conveyed to the trustees of the parish on a lease of 999 years at a nominal rent of 1*s.* per annum; but as the Incorporated Commissioners for Building Churches and Chapels cannot advance any part of the funds at their disposal, to be laid out on a terminable lease—or, in other words, as the ground must be a freehold tenure—they cannot, it appears, advance the thousand pounds which they have promised for this purpose, until the plot of ground shall have been conveyed as freehold property, which, no doubt, will soon be accomplished, as the Company has the power of doing so with respect to sites for churches only. The sum which has been collected in this parish for the above purpose is more than 2,000*l.*, and that amount, added to the sum to be given by the Commissioners, will go a considerable way towards the erection of a church capable of holding from three to four thousand persons.

DEAN AND CHAPTER OF EXETER AND THE CHURCH COMMISSION.—The Dean and Chapter of Exeter have presented a second memorial, or protest against the propositions of the Church Commissioners, relative to prebends, &c. The document (which is of some length) contains the following passage:—"The Chapter have, in their former memorial, with all respect and deference to the high names attached to the report, urged their reasons against the transferring to the Bishops so very large a portion of the whole ecclesiastical patronage as that of all the benefices belonging not only to the separate dignities which are to be suppressed, but to those belonging to the Deans and Chapters in their corporate capacity. The Chapter are, upon reflection, fully confirmed in the grounds they have taken for those objections. In principle, the Chapter think it can never be maintained that a body, intended to be preserved in full respectability and efficiency, will not be competent to dispose of its preferments to the advantage of the Church at large."

ORDINATION.—The Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells will hold an Ordination on Sunday, the 9th of April.

DESTRUCTION OF ST. PETER'S CHURCH, EATON-SQUARE, LONDON.—The flames, which were first observed to issue from the belfry, soon afterwards communicated to the body of the church, and, in a very short time, the altar, the pews, the seats in the aisles, and the pulpit, were in flames. The engines commenced playing at the south side of the church, over the organ loft, through a hole made in one of the windows; but, notwithstanding the utmost exertions, the flames spread with such rapidity that in about a quarter of an hour, the entire of the roof was one blaze of fire. About seven the flames burst through the windows at the east end of the building, immediately over the Communion Table, and continued raging about half an hour, when the roof of the church, at its western extremity, fell. Before the remaining portion of the roof fell in, which occurred about eight o'clock, all the cushions, oaken sides of the pews, the plate, silver candlesticks, and all the furniture in the vestry, were saved. The beautiful painting of the "Scourging of Christ," over the Communion Table, valued at 1,000*l.*, and presented to the church by the British Institution, was saved by the exertions of Mr. John Thurston, of Ebury-street, at the imminent risk of his life. The altar-piece, a painting by Hilton, representing the Crucifixion, presented by the Marquis of Westminster, and which was valued at 1,000 guineas, was also preserved by the exertions of the police and the fire brigade. The organ, which cost 700*l.*, is entirely destroyed, and the loss in painted glass is said to amount to several hundred pounds. The building, which was erected in the year 1826, was insured in the Westminster office for 6000*l.*, and the damage is estimated at 20,000*l.* The fire is supposed to have originated in the belfry, through the carelessness of some men employed in cleaning the clock, who forgot their lights, or but partially extinguished them.

FACTS ABOUT IRELAND.—Previous to the Union, Ireland enjoyed but *one* charitable institution, and this supported 700 persons, whereas now it supports *thirty thousand*.—Before the Union there were only *Parochial Protestant schools*; now we have—

	Scholars.
Association Schools	20,000
Sunday Schools	185,000
Kildare Place Society	137,000

With regard to public charities, in the dreadful year 1829—

Irish Protestants subscribed . . .	£3,554 10 10
Roman Catholics	192 13 9
In Protestant Churches, in addition	1,045 4 2
Roman Catholic Chapels	336 2 6

To the Mendicity Society, in the year 1833, was subscribed—

By Protestants	£4,455 18 2
Catholics	408 5 0

Whereas, the relative number of persons relieved were—

Roman Catholics	1846
Protestants	150

The amount contributed to the Cork-street Fever Hospital was—

Protestants	£368 8 7
Romanists	10 18 0

The proportion of admission was, of Catholics over Protestants, ten to one. The contributions to the Sick and Poor Institution in Meath-street, are—

By Protestants	£176 17 1
Romanists	10 1 0

Whilst the proportion of Roman Catholics to Protestants relieved, is *twenty to one*. The sum contributed to the Lying-in Hospital, from its foundation to the year 1827, was—

By Protestants	£35,503 2 1
Romanists	157 10 0

And the patients admitted were—

Roman Catholics	103,452
Protestants	17,242

Do not these little figures speak volumes in favour of the much-maligned cause of the Protestants? But we are assured by Lord Melbourne and the rest of the ministerial minions of the Dictator, that Protestantism is in ruins, and that therefore it requires an extra kick only to lay it prostrate altogether.

VICARAGE OF BINGLEY, YORKSHIRE.—The Lord Bishop of Ripon has sequestered the Vicarage of Bingley, Yorkshire; the Rev. H. Atkinson, of Leeds, has been appointed officiating Curate, *pro tempore*. On the subject of this Vicarage the following letter has been addressed to the Lord Bishop of Ripon:—

“My Lord,—Since you were installed in the sacred office of Lord Bishop of this diocese, you have done every thing in your power to promote the spiritual interests of the people committed to your care, and by so doing have gained the good opinion of every religious sect and political party. My bringing the following case under your notice needs no apology. On the 26th of October, the Rev. Dr. Hartley, the Vicar of Bingley, died; since which time the official duties have been performed by his curate, who preached his farewell sermon on Sunday last, having previously, by your Lordship's directions, read a sequestration of the church property, in which it is declared that the parish of Bingley is destitute of a Clergyman. Soon after the death of the late vicar, a memorial, signed in a day and a half by 1525 parishioners, was presented to the Lord Chancellor, humbly beseeching him to appoint the Rev. Johnson Atkinson Busfeild, D.D., to the vicarage. It has yet been of no avail: but his Lordship and friends have offered it to three Clergymen, as a reward for their political services, all of whom have refused it. Allow me earnestly to implore your Lordship to use that influence with the Lord Chancellor which your sacred office gives you; tell him that he has no right to barter the salvation of men's souls for political purposes: remind him that he will have to give a full account of his stewardship at the judgment seat of God, and that the dreadful responsibility of allowing a parish with 10,000 inhabitants to be destitute of a vicar rests entirely on *his* head. My Lord, I fervently pray that through your instrumentality we may yet be allowed

to have the object of our choice ; if you are successful you will have the gratitude of this populous parish ; if unsuccessful an approving conscience of having done your duty in that station to which it has pleased God to call you.

" I have the honour to be, my Lord,

" Your Lordship's most obedient and humble servant,

" *Bingley, Jan. 5, 1837.*"

" **A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH WHICH IS
DESTITUTE OF A CLERGYMAN.**

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS.

Lichfield Diocesan and District Committee.—At the Fourteenth Annual Meeting, holden in the Consistory Court of the Cathedral, on Monday, the 2d day of January, 1837, the Hon. and Very Rev. the DEAN OF LICHFIELD in the Chair ;—A letter from the Lord Bishop of the Diocese having been read by the Secretary, It was resolved, on the motion of the Rev. Thomas Levett, seconded by the Rev. H. G. Lonsdale,

That the Chairman be requested to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of his Lordship's letter, accepting the office of President of the Committee ; and to express their deep regret that the state of his Lordship's health should have prevented his attendance on the present occasion.

It was resolved, on the motion of the Rev. Thomas Grove, seconded by Henry Chinn, Esq.,

That the Committee concurs in the recommendation of the Standing Committee in London, that in future all Annual Subscriptions be considered due on the first day of January, for the current year.

On the motion of the Rev. Canon Newling, seconded by John Haworth, Esq., it was resolved,

That the Committee views with great satisfaction the appointment of three additional colonial Bishops during the past year ; as well as the increased number of the Society's Missionaries in Southern India, and the successful progress which appears to have been made in the religious instruction of the emancipated negroes in the West Indies.

It appeared from the Treasurer's Accounts, that several new Subscribers had been added to the list of the Committee in the course of the year ; and a balance, amounting to £132 4s. 6d. remitted to the Parent Society.

On the motion of the Rev. Thomas Grove, seconded by the Rev. H. G. Lonsdale, the thanks of the Meeting were given to the Chairman ; and to the Secretary and Treasurer.

It was resolved, on the motion of Henry Chinn, Esq., seconded by the Rev. George Madan,

That the proceedings of this day be inserted, with a List of the Subscriptions, in the *Staffordshire Advertiser*.

The Committee sincerely trust that the friends of this venerable and excellent Institution will exert their utmost endeavours to supply the very serious deficiency in its funds, occasioned by the discontinuance of the Parliamentary Grant, which has rendered it necessary to diminish the salaries of the numerous Missionaries, and other officers engaged in promoting, with unabated energy and zeal, the designs and objects of the Society. SPENCER MADAN, *Diocesan Secretary.*

It is satisfactory to observe, that an interest appears to be excited in all classes, and especially among the laity, in favour of an institution which has been actively employed during nearly a century and a half in diffusing the pure light of Christianity throughout the dependencies of the British empire :—196 clergymen of the Church of England, as missionaries, and 167 readers and schoolmasters, are engaged in the service, and supported wholly or in part from the funds of this Society.

REFORMATION OF GIPSIES.—An interesting scene was lately witnessed at the residence of the Rev. James Crabb, at Hill, near Southampton. It is, we believe, generally known, that through the zealous exertions of the Rev. Gentleman, a number of the miserable gipsy race have been reclaimed from their predatory habits ; some have been taught trades, and weaned from their wandering life ; many of the girls have been put out to service, and the boys apprenticed ; and, above all, they have been converted from little better than heathenism to Chris-

tianity. On the morning of the day above alluded to, 17 reformed, and 78 wandering gipsies, were assembled in the school-house attached to Mr. Crabb's residence; and prayers having been read, they were addressed in a very impressive manner by their worthy benefactor. Divine service being concluded, the gipsies retired to the play ground, while the good minister addressed the visitors present. He stated, that during the eight years the Southampton Society for the Reformation of the Gipsies had been in existence, forty-seven gipsies had been taken under its especial care as reformed characters; of these, fourteen had returned to their old habits, three had died, seven were dependent on the funds of the institution, and twenty-three supported themselves by creditable pursuits. Mr. C. next stated that the little gipsy colony in Gloucestershire, supported by a benevolent lady, was prosperous; and that the efforts of the Home Missionary at Charmouth, near Bridport, were attended with success. The farmers in many places now showed kindness to the gipsies, giving them straw and fuel, and they evinced their gratitude by watching their premises; no robbery ever took place while they were in the neighbourhood of their benefactors.—In enumerating the various donations and subscriptions which had been forwarded to him, Mr. C. stated, that a humble clergyman in Dorsetshire had sent an anonymous donation of £1; he wished he knew the generous donor, and hoped he might be permitted the gratification of his acquaintance. Another gentleman had sent twelve copies of the Bible for distribution among the gipsies, and the value of such a gift was great indeed. When they had dined, a distribution of blankets, flannel, stockings, &c., together with the Bibles before mentioned, next took place; and finally the Gipsies' Anniversary was concluded amidst the prayers and blessings of the objects of such praiseworthy bounty.

ALEXANDER OF RUSSIA.—Abstract of an Ukase.—We are indebted to a friend for the subjoined copy of an imperial ukase issued by the late Emperor Alexander of Russia. The severe but just rebuke which it contains, resembling in some respects the one given by our king Canute to his servile flatterers, was called forth by gross adulation to the Emperor when he was on his last tour through his dominions; a short time was only suffered to elapse after its publication, before that monarch ceased to reign or live.

Ukase addressed to the Legislative Synod at Moscow, by Alexander, Emperor of Russia, dated from Moscow, October 27, 1817.

“ During my late travels through the provinces, I was obliged, to my no small regret, to listen to speeches pronounced in different parts, which contained unbecoming praises of me—praises which can only be ascribed unto God. And as I am convinced in the depth of my heart of the christian truth, that every blessing floweth unto us through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ alone, and that every man, be he who he may, without Christ, is full only of evil; therefore to ascribe unto me the glory of deeds in which the hand of God had been evidently manifested before the whole world, is to give unto men that glory which belongeth unto Almighty God alone.

“ I account it my duty, therefore, to forbid all such unbecoming expressions of praise, and recommend that, on similar occasions in future, the people refrain from all such expressions of praise, so disagreeable to my ears; and that they may render unto the Lord of Hosts alone thanksgivings for the blessings bestowed upon us, and pray for the outpouring of his grace upon all of us; conforming themselves in this matter to the words of sacred writ, which requires us to render to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, honour and glory, for ever and ever.

“ ALEXANDER.”

THE SPOILS OF THE CHURCHES IN SPAIN are becoming a source of wealth to speculators. An English vessel, the *Four Friends*, lately arrived at Marseilles with a cargo of no fewer than 93 bells and other articles from the churches and convents. The bells have been landed, and are exposed on the quay. It is not yet known whether they are to be sold entire or melted. At all events, Spain is about to be despoiled for ever of the donations given by the pious during a course of ten centuries; and the objects spared even by the Moors are on the point of falling under the destructive banners of the *Bandes Noires*, without any lasting advantage to the Spanish treasury, and solely for the benefit of a few rapacious individuals.

GRESHAM MUSICAL PRIZE.—The Gresham Prize Medal, for the best composition in Church music, has recently been awarded to the Rev. William Henry Havergal, M.A., of St. Edmund Hall, Rector of Astley, Worcestershire. The successful composition is an evening service (*Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis*) in the key of A major. The umpires of the prize were Dr. Crotch; R. I. S. Stevens, Esq. Professor of Music in Gresham College; and W. Horsley, Esq. Mus. Bac.

AUGMENTATION OF THE VICARAGE OF FORDINGHAM.—The Rev. Charles B. Pearson, M.A., of Oriel College, Prebendary of Fordingham, in the Cathedral of Salisbury, has recently augmented the Vicarage of Fordingham to 300*l.* per annum, according to the provisions of the Archbishop's Act, made for that purpose.

THE MARRIAGE ACT.—The following are the comparative charges for celebrating marriages under the old and new system of things:—

<i>New System.</i>	<i>Registrar's license 3<i>l.</i>, stamp 10<i>s.</i>, notice of marriage 1<i>s.</i>, £ s. d.</i>	<i>registrar's certificate 1<i>s.</i>, marriage certificate 2<i>s. 6d.</i>, performer's fee 7<i>s. 6d.</i></i>	<i>4 2 0</i>
<i>Old System.</i>	<i>Surrogate's license 3<i>l.</i>, fee at church (average) 7<i>s. 6d.</i>, certificate demandable 0<i>l. 0s. 0d.</i></i>		<i>3 7 6</i>
<i>New System.</i>	<i>Notice of marriage 1<i>s.</i>, registrar's certificate of it 1<i>s.</i>, registrar's fee 5<i>s.</i>, certificate of marriage 2<i>s. 6d.</i></i>		<i>0 9 6</i>
<i>Old System.</i>	<i>Putting in bans 1<i>s.</i>, fee (average) 5<i>s.</i>, certificate demandable 0<i>l. 0s. 0d.</i></i>		<i>0 6 0</i>

From this it appears the extra charge in one instance is 14*s. 6d.*, and in the other 3*s. 6d.!!* Besides which, it ought not to be overlooked, that nothing whatever is specified or provided in the Act, to limit the amount of fees demandable by any officiator in marriages in a licensed place of worship; so that the person officiating may charge just what he pleases; and if he refuses to perform the ceremony until that charge is satisfied, the parties aggrieved have no remedy whatever.

LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY DIOCESAN CHURCH-BUILDING SOCIETY.—The quarterly meeting of the General Committee of the Lichfield and Coventry Diocesan Church Building Society was lately held at the Blue-coat School, in Birmingham, and was attended by the Hon. and Very Rev. the Dean of Lichfield, the Archdeacons of Coventry and Stafford, and by delegates from the different archdeaconries. A letter was read from the Bishop of the diocese, in which his Lordship expressed, in most feeling and affectionate terms, his deep sorrow that protracted indisposition prevented his attendance; and a resolution was passed by the meeting of sincere regret for his Lordship's absence, and for the cause, together with their thanks for the very kind communication with which they had been favoured.—In the course of the proceedings the following grants were made:—

Towards a new Church at the Lozells, Aston	£900*
Enlarging St. Bartholomew's Chapel, Birmingham	400*
Increasing Radford Semele Church	80
Increasing Fillongley Church	50
A new Chapel, Amington, near Tamworth	60
A gallery in Armitage Church	14
A new Church at Wellington, Salop	750
Increasing Newport Church, do.	25
A gallery in Shifnal Church	25
Ditto Greensill Church	10
A new Church at Derby	400
A gallery in Little Eaton Church	35
A new Church at Denisthorpe, near Measham	200
A gallery at Bolsover Church, Derbyshire	25

The grants of 378*l.* in aid of the restoration of St. Peter's Church in Birmingham, and of 130*l.* towards the erection of a new Chapel at Shustoke, were renewed.

* To be increased respectively to 1000*l.* and 450*l.* if the funds of the district will permit.

BAPTISM OF JEWS.—There has lately been a public baptism of six Jews, at St. Bride's Church, Liverpool.

WINCHESTER SCHOOL.—In addition to 5000*l.* appropriated by the College towards the new buildings, Dr. Williams, the late master, has given 500*l.*; Dr. Moberly, of Balliol College, the present master, 250*l.*; Mr. Wordsworth, the second master, 100*l.*; Sir William Heathcote, 200*l.*; and an anonymous donor, with the initials A. B., 1000*l.*

TEN LIVINGS TRANSFERRED TO TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN.—The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, through the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, have presented to Trinity College, Dublin, for disposal, the following livings in the suppressed dioceses in Ireland, to become possessed of them, on the demise of their present incumbents:—Clonfert diocese, Aughrim; Cloyne diocese, Ballymoney; Dromore diocese, Clonbane; Kildare diocese, Leagh, Skreen; Elphin diocese, St. John's, Sligo; Waterford diocese, Drumcannon; Raphoe diocese, Drumholme; Ossory diocese, Kilnaghnack.

HARROW SCHOOL.—The Governors and Masters of Harrow School, anxious to meet the wishes of the public with respect to expense, have agreed to reduce the terms for boarding ten guineas, and private tuition five guineas, which, with several extras, will make a difference of at least twenty guineas a-year. This will, of course, to many, be an important object; but what is still more so is, the improved plans of the new Head Master, the Rev. Mr. Wordsworth. He encourages mathematics and modern languages, which will, for the future, form a part of the examinations, both for classes and scholarships. Indeed, he seems quite prepared to carry out a more general system of education than has hitherto been adopted in public schools, and to impress upon the higher classes the necessity of their keeping pace with, if not going beyond, the middle classes of society, by a solid education.

LIBERALITY OF THE REV. W. BURNE.—The parish church of Grittenton, Wilts, has lately been considerably enlarged, at the sole charge of the Rev. W. Burne, the rector, the expense exceeding 1000*l.*

ORDINATIONS.—1837.

By His Grace the Archbishop of York.

DEACONS.

Name.	Degree.	College.	University.
Curshaw, Curzon	B.A.	Caius	Cambridge
Dabius, William		Corpus Christi	Cambridge
Dayrell, Robert William	B.A.	Magdalene	Cambridge
Edwards, T.	B.A.	St. John's	Cambridge
Elliott, Ebenezer	B.A.	St. Peter's	Cambridge
Gresham, John Hepworth	B.A.	St. John's	Cambridge
Ison, John Leverack	B.A.	St. John's	Cambridge
Lewis, Philip	B.A.	University	Oxford
Reynardson, George Birch	B.A.	Trinity	Cambridge
Robinson, Charles Walter	B.A.	Emmanuel	Cambridge
Sutton, Thomas	B.A.	Emmanuel	Cambridge
Trapp, Benjamin	M.A.	Clare Hall	Cambridge

FRIESTS.

Dixon, John	B.A.	St. John's	Cambridge
Dobson, John Ralph	B.A.	Lincoln	Oxford
Etty, Walter Hamilton	B.A.	St. John's	Cambridge
Melville, William Ryland	B.A.	St. Peter's	Cambridge
Newton, John Horsley	B.A.	Trinity	Cambridge
Rhodes, Gregory	B.A.	Trinity Hall	Cambridge
Sterling, Charles James	B.A.	St. Mary Hall	Oxford

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Degree.</i>	<i>College.</i>	<i>University.</i>
Strickland, Emmanuel	B.A.	Queen's ¹	Cambridge
Waltham, Joshua	B.A.	St. John's	Cambridge

By the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.

DEACONS.

Barne, Henry	B.A.	Exeter	Oxford
Clark, John Perkins	(let. dim.)	B.A.	Worcester
Evans, Arthur	ditto	B.A.	Pembroke
Fane, Arthur	ditto	B.A.	Exeter
Peake, George Eden	B.A.	Magdalen Hall	Oxford
Smith, Hinton Castle	B.A.	Wadham	Oxford
Spragge, Charles Henry	B.A.	Exeter	Oxford

PRIESTS.

Eyre, Frederick Kinneer	(let. dim.)	B.A.	St. John's	Oxford
-----------------------------------	-------------	------	------------	--------

By the Lord Bishop of Chichester.

DEACONS.

Cookeley, Henry Parker	B.A.	Trinity	Cambridge
Drosier, Thomas	B.A.	Sidney Sussex	Cambridge
Hall, William	B.A.	St. Edmund Hall	Oxford
Hayes, Charles	B.A.	Clare Hall	Cambridge
Notley, Charles		St. John's	Cambridge
Tennant, Robert John	M.A.	Trinity	Cambridge
Wilson, William	B.A.	Queen's	Oxford

PRIESTS.

Coates, Robert Patch	B.A.	St. John's	Cambridge
Forster, C. M.	M.A.	Oriel	Oxford
Keppel, Hon. T. R.	M.A.	Downing	Cambridge
Scott, Hon. William Hugh	M.A.	St. John's	Cambridge
Smyth, Thomas Graham		Trinity	Oxford
Spry, Arthur Brown	B.A.	Trinity	Oxford
Thomlinson, William R.	M.A.	St. John's	Cambridge

By the Lord Bishop of Chester.

DEACON.

D'Arcy, John	B.A.	Brasennose	Oxford
------------------------	------	------------	--------

PRIESTS.

Edwards, John Wilkinson	B.A.	Brasennose	Oxford
James, H. G.	B.A.	Brasennose	Oxford
Slade, George	B.A.	St. Edmund Hall	Oxford

PREFERMENTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>Net Value.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
		£			
Allen, H.	St. Mary-le-Wigford	115	Lincoln	Lincoln	Rev. H. C. Ord
Barking, L. B.	Burham	388	Kent	Rochester	C. Milner, Esq.
Bradshaw, S.	Grindon	314	Stafford	L. & C.	Mrs. Bradshaw
Carus, W.	Holy Trinity	96	Camb.	Ely	Bp. of Ely
Chambers, J. P.	Swerford	496	Oxford	Oxford	Magd. Coll.
Cheadle, J.	Bingley	233	York	York	Lord Chancellor
Chisholm, C.	Southchurch	760	Essex	Canterb.	Abp. of Canterbury
Craven, C.	St. Peter's, Birmingham.			Warwick	L. & C. Treas. of Lich. Cath.
Creaser, J.	Colan	163	Cornwall	Exeter	Bp. of Exeter
Field, S. H.	Honey Church	70	Devon	Exeter	J. Alliston, Esq.
Gream, R.	Rotherfield	1454	Sussex	Chichest.	E. of Abergavenny
Griffiths, T.	Limmington	366	Somerset	B. & W.	Wadham Coll.

Name.	Preferment.	Net Value.	County.	Diocese.	Patron.
Hall, G.	Chapel-en-le-Frith	145	Derby	P. of D. & C. of Lich.	Trustees.
Jennings, J.	Preb. of Westminster		Middlesex	London	The King
Keppel, A. W.	Haynsford	398	Norfolk	Norwich	R. Marsham, Esq.
Kynaston, J.	Tideswell	109	Derby	Pec. of D. & C. of Lich.	
Miller, H.	{ Tannington cum Brundish	196	Suffolk	Norwich	Bp. of Rochester
Mills, T.	Whittinger	111	Northam.	Peterboro'	Marq. of Exeter
Morgan, D.	Llancarvan	163	Glamorg.	Llandaff	Lord Chancellor
Robinson, H.	Babraham	106	Camb.	Ely	H. J. Adeane, Esq.
Sargeaunt, J.	Stanwick	373	Northam.	Peterboro'	Lord Chancellor
Sergeantson, E.	Kirkby Stephen	356	Westmor.	Carlisle	Incumbent
Thomas, E.	Britonferry	124	Glamorg.	Llandaff	Earl of Jersey
Thomas, J.	Walton, East	60	Pembroke	St. David's	Col. J. P. L. Philips
Todd, F.	St. Peter's Marylebone	600	Middlesex	London	The King
Turner, C.	St. Mich. at Thorne	88	Norfolk	Norw.	Dowager Lady Suf- field
Walters, N.	{ St. Peter's and All Saints, Stamford	431	Lincoln	Lincoln	Marq. of Exeter
Willan, J.	South Witham	120	Lincoln	Lincoln	Lord Huntingtower
Wilde, S. D.	Fletching	167	Sussex	Chichest.	Earl of Sheffield
Williams, T.	Llangstone	158	Monmou.	Llandaff	Rev. G. Gore
Wimberley, C. M.	Donington-on-Baine	173	Lincoln	Lincoln	Lord Monson
Windham, R. C.	Chilton	150	Suffolk	Norwich	W.H. Windham, Esq.

CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

Beavan, E.	{ Great Washbourn Oxoneton	59 68	Gloster	G. & B.	{ Own Presentation Earl of Coventry
Bradford, J. H.	Trinity	111	Devon	Exeter	D. & C. of Exeter
Crosby, R.	Haggerstone	157	Middlesex	London	Rev. H. Plimley
Farish, W.	St. Giles & St. Peter	170	Camb.	Ely	Bp. of Ely
Finch, T.	{ Barrington and Hauxton	107	Camb.	Ely	{ Trin. Coll. Camb. & D. & C. of Ely
Fearon, J.	Portisham	74	Dorset	Bristol	J. Hardy, Esq.
Graham, W.	{ Wardley cum Belton	287	Rutland	Peterboro'	Lord Chancellor
Hatch, G. A.	St. Matthew, Friday-st.	254	Middlesex	London	Bp. of London
Hawes, H. D.D.	{ Mellis St. Edmund	232 176	Suffolk	Norwich	Lord Chancellor
Jones, H. W.	Nerquis	92	Wilts	Salisbury	Bp. of Salisbury
Keysall, J.	Bredon	1498	Flintshire	St. Asaph	Vicar of Mold
Lewis, H.	Liangoven	120	Worc.	Worc.	J. Keysall, Esq.
Llewellyn, H.	{ St. George Michaelston-on-Ely	124 83	Monmou.	Llandaff	Ch. of Llandaff
Lloyd, H.	Llangeitho	106	Glamorg.	Llandaff	L. Traherne, Esq.
Martin, T.	Moorthy	140	Cardigan	St. David's	Bp. of St. David's
Price, T.	{ Enville Bredicot	979 120	Lincoln	Lincoln	Bp. of Carlisle
Rawlings, W.	Padstow	202	Stafford	I. & C.	Own Presentation
Roe, J. T.	Swerford	496	Worc.	Worc.	D. & C. of Worcester
Salvador, J. L.	Stanton-on-Wye	340	Cornwall	Exeter	Rev. C. P. Brune
Smyth, R.	{ Stapleford Tawney with Thoydon Mt.	735	Oxford	Oxford	Magdalen Coll.
Taylor, J.	{ St. Mich. at Thorne Diptford	88 532	Hereford	Hereford	Trustees
Thomas, E.	Haynsford	398	Essex	London	Sir T. Smith [field
Topp, J.	Llancarvan	163	Norfolk	Norwich	Dowager Lady Suf- field
Vaughan, H.	Woolaston	95	Devon	Exeter	Mrs. Taylor
Tennant, F.	Crickhowell	79	Norfolk	Norwich	R. Marsham, Esq.
	Orton Waterville	354	Salop	Llandaff	Lord Chancellor
			Brecon	Hereford	Vicar of Alderbury
			Hunts	St. David's	Rect. of Crickhowell
				Lincoln	Pemb. Coll. Camb.

APPOINTMENTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Appointment.</i>
Ashworth, J. A.	Chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford.
Chinnery, St. L.	Curacy of St. Ann's, Shandon.
Elliott, E.	Curacy of New Mill, near Sheffield.
Gray, W.	Chaplain to the Earl of Dunmore.
Hawes, T.	Minor Canonry in Wells Cathedral.
Harvey, H.	Rural Dean in the Deanery of Potterne.
Herbert, O.	Curacy of the Chapel of Ease, Shandon.
Hoare, E. N.	Archdeaconry of Ardfert.
Honey, W. H.	Rural Dean of the Deanery of Chalke.
Lawford, J. G.	Chaplaincy of the Bucks General Infirmary.
Parsons, H.	Rural Dean of the Deanery of Gloucester.
Skipsey, R.	Chaplain to the Earl of Tyrconnell.
Surridge, J.	Chaplain to H. M. S. Stag.
utton, R.	{ Commissary for the New Archdeaconry of Craven, in the Diocese of Ripon.
Tahmase, J. M.	Chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford.
Thompson, H. T.	Chaplain to the Union House, Thingoe.
Wood, J. R.	Chaplain in Ordinary to the King.

OBITUARY.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Appointment or Residence.</i>
Batty, R.	Curate of Sandbach.
Carey, J.	Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.
Drury, A. J. D.D.	At Sunbury, Middlesex, and formerly of Trinity Coll.
Edwards, J. N.	At Totness, Devon.
Farish, G.	At Madeira, and formerly of Queen's Coll. Cambridge.
Johnstone, J.	{ At Monnett House, near Birmingham, and formerly of Merton Coll. Oxford.
Kennedy, J.	Fox Hollies, near Birmingham.
Mackenzie, J.	Minister of Portpatrick.
Russell, J.	Caius College, Cambridge.
Sutcliffe, H. H.	Head Master of Blackwood Free Grammar School.
Wilson, W.	Head Master of Free Grammar School, Hull.
Wyld, G.	Pembroke College, Oxford.

OXFORD.

Congregations will be held for the purpose of granting Graces, and conferring Degrees, on the following days in the ensuing term, viz. —

February,	Friday,	3,
—	Thursday,	9,
—	Thursday,	16,
—	Thursday,	23,
March,	Thursday,	2,
—	Thursday,	9,
—	Saturday,	18.

No person will, on any account, be admitted as a candidate for the degrees of B.A. or M.A. or for that of B.C.L. or B.M. without proceeding through Arts, whose name is not entered in the book kept for that purpose, at the Vice-Chancellor's house, on or before the day preceding the day of Congregation.

On Tuesday, Feb. 7, a Congregation will be held, as provided in the Dispensation for intermitting the Forms and Exercises of Determination, *solely* for the purpose of receiving from the Deans or

other Officers of their respective Colleges or Halls, the names of such Bachelors of Arts as have not yet determined: and their names having been so signified to the House, and thereupon inserted in the Register of Congregation, they may at any time in the same, or in any future Term, be admitted to all the Rights and Privileges to which they would have been entitled by the intermitting Forms and Exercises.

And every Bachelor of Arts is desired to take notice, that unless he has proceeded to that Degree *on or before Friday, February 3*, his name cannot be inserted in the Register of Congregation during the present year.

DEGREES CONFERRED.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Rev. George Delgarno Hill, Trinity Coll.
Rev. Henry Blisset, Balliol Coll.

BACHELOR OF ARTS.

Robert Alexander, Christ Church.

CAMBRIDGE.

The premium for the Hulsean dissertation has been adjudged to John Murray, B.A. of Trinity College.—Subject, “How far our Saviour’s Miracles were typical of the nature of the Christian Dispensation.”

Seatonian Prize Poem.—The subject of the poem for the present year is, “St. Paul at Ephesus.”

Hulsean Dissertation.—The following is the subject of the Hulsean dissertation for the present year;—“To compare the evidence which Christians of the present age have for the truth of the Gospel, with that which the first converts possessed.”

The Rev. Richard Parkinson, M. A. of St. John’s College, Fellow of the Collegiate Church of Manchester, has been elected Hulsean Lecturer.

The following will be the subjects of examination in the last week of the Lent Term, 1838:

- 1.—The Gospel of St. Mark.
- 2.—Paley’s Evidences of Christianity.

3.—Demosthenes’ First Phillipic and Oration ‘de Pace.’

4.—The Fifteenth Book of Ovid’s Metamorphoses.

DEGREES CONFERRED.

QUEEN’S COLLEGE.

The Rev. William Webster, B.A. third master of the City of London School, has been elected by the President and Fellows of Queen’s College, to the Fellowship founded in 1694, by D. Edwards, Gent.

TRINITY HALL.

John Stuart Russell, LL.B. and John Watts Ebden, M.A. of the Middle Temple, barristers-at-law, have been elected Fellows of Trinity Hall, in this University.

The meetings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society for the present term, are fixed for Monday, Feb. 13; Monday, Feb. 27; Monday, March 13.

BACHELORS’ COMMENCEMENT, January 21, 1837.

[Those gentlemen whose names are within brackets are equal.]

Those gentlemen whose names are preceded by an asterisk have one or more terms to keep previous to being admitted to their degrees, although they had passed their examination in the following order of arrangement.

MODERATORS.

James W. L. Heavside, M.A. Sidney | Edwin Steventon, M.A. Corpus Christi.

EXAMINERS.

Samuel Earnshaw, M.A. St. John’s | Henry Philpott, M.A. Cath. Hall.

WRANGLERS.

Griffin,	Joh.	Hodgkinson, Trin.	Humphry,	Trin.	Macmichael, Trin.
*Sylvester,	Joh.	Craufurd, Jesus	Ebsworth,	Clare	Broom, Trin.
Brumell,	Joh.	Blake,	Day,	Pemb.	Simpson, Corpus
*Green,	Caius	Elwyn,	Pemb.	Kennion,	Fitz Herbert, Joh.
*Gregory,	Trin.	Dalton,	{ Caius	Ramsden,	Joh.
Ellis,	Trin.	Holmes,	Cath.	Mason,	Chr.
Hemery,	Trin.	Rackham,	Jesus	Shaw,	Peirson, } Clare
Maitland,	Trin.	Bell,	Clare	Johnson,	Marsh, Pemb.
†Thacker,	Trin.	Windle,	Trin.	Osbourne,	Clarkson, Jesus
Raven,	Magd.	Gurney,	Joh.	Conybeare,	Brigham, Pemb.
Pulling,	Corpus	Sadler,	Trin.	Stooks,	Horneman, Pemb.
Barton,	Trin.	*Sharpe,	Joh.	Biggs,	Routh, Chr.
Reynolds,	Qu.	Sykes,	Trin.	Hodgson } Jesus	Heath, Tr. H.
				Niven } Joh.	Howson, Trin.

SENIOR OPTIMES.

Haworth,	Qu.	Metcalfe,	Jesus	Freeman,	Pet.	Reynolds,	Joh.
Cotterill,	Joh.	Grey,	Corpus	Brown, J. L.	Joh.	Bazett,	Trin.
Smalley,	Joh.	Upcher,	Trin.	Gordon,	Pemb.	Martin,	Joh.
Watson,	Caius	Clarkson,	Joh.	Smithson,	Joh.	Benson,	Joh.
Hickman,	Joh.	Gilbert,	Emm.	Rowland,	Joh.	Hargrave,	Trin.
Fleming,	Chr.	Lacey,	Pemb.	Whytehead,	Joh.	Atkinson,	Magd.
Grant,	Trin.	Slack,	Qu.	*Phillipps,	Trin.	Carrington,	Caius
Buckley,	Magd.	Coombs,	Joh.	Smith,	Qu.	*Clint,	Trin.

† Not admitted as an Honor.

JUNIOR OPTIMES.

Shepherd,	Pemb.	Baker,	Job.	Scadding,	Joh.	Herries,	Trin.
Bennett,	Trin.	Mayor,	Trin.	Kirke,	Chr.	Mungearm,	Joh.
*Cook,	Corp.	*Dorrington,	Emm.	Harper,	Joh.	Thomson,	Jesus.
*Smyth,	Trin.	E. Trin.		Sandars,	Emm.	Colson,	Pemb.
Kirkpatrick,	Tr. H.	Hawkins,		Hildyard,	Pemb.	Beardsworth,	Joh.
Dennis,	Pemb.	Bryan,	Pet.	Greatheed,	Chr.	Roberts,	Emm.
Harris,	Trin.	Laycock,	Clare	Browne, F.	Joh.	Watson,	Corpus
Thurlow,	Trin.	Westmorland,	Sid.	Tower,	Joh.	*Fraser, A.	Trin.
Bromby,	Joh.	Hawkins, R.	Trin.	Rodwell,	Trin.	Wood,	Joh.
Jeffery,	Joh.	Lowe,	Trin.	Scarborough,	Chr.		

* * * * *

Beaufort,	Jesus	*Freese,	Trin.	Knox,	Sid.	*Skeete,	Caius
Bland,	Jesus	Kennedy,	Trin.	Lund,	Trin.	Ward,	Caius
Boys,	Joh.	*Kennedy,	Joh.	Scarborough,	Magd.	*Wright,	Trin.
Farmer,	Caius						

Ingram,	Trin.	*Wilson, sen.	Qu.	Cornwall,	Joh.	*Chadwick,	Corp.
Windsor,	Cath.	Hill,	Corpus	Birley,	Joh.	Hobson,	Joh.
*Simpson,	Qu.	Howard,	Qu.	Buck,	Sid.	*Compton,	Ld. Trin.
Parker,	Corpus	Dumergue,	Trin.	*Ricardo,	Trin.	Clancy,	Caius
Thomas,	Corpus	*Gibbon,	Cath.	*Neville,	Magd.	*Blandy,	Trin.
Wanton,	Joh.	Burrell,	Trin.	Thurlow,	Joh.	*Trench,	Magd.
Christmas,	Joh.	La Motte,	Emm.	Finch,	Corpus	Colquhoun,	Joh.
Wagstaff,	Trin.	*Ibbotson,	Chr.	Canham,	Trin.	Thackeray,	Pem.
Deck,	Chr.	*Wright,	Chr.	*Armstrong	Joh.	Wodehouse,	Trin.
Charlton,	Trin.	*Scrivenor,	Qu.	Boggis,	Tr. H.	Lake,	Trin.
Day,	Corp.	Marshall,	Emm.	*Foster,	Trin.	Newcome,	Trin.
Palmer,	Cath.	Gordon,	Trin.	Polwhele,	Trin.	Jepson,	Joh.
Arkwright,	Trin.	*Dashwood,	Down.	*Bartlett,	Trin.	Charlesworth,	Joh.
Birt,	Corpus	*Nelson,	Qu.	Parry,	Trin.	Oddie,	Trin.
Jones,	Clare	Clarke, J.	Joh.	Partridge,	Corpus	*Clementi,	Trin.
Bayldon,	Jes.	Harrison,	Magd.	Gazeley,	Chr.	*Sabben,	Qu.
Fraser, D.	Trin.	Littlejohn,	Corpus	Hill,	Trin.	*Bond,	Trin.
Carlyon,	Pemb.	*Reddall,	Corpus	Jessopp,	Joh.	*Knapton,	Qu.
Smythies,	Emm.	Dudley,	Cath.	Romaine,	Trin.	Solly,	Trin.
Wood,	Trin.	Neumann,	Pet.	Harman,	Clare	Guthrie,	Trin.
Fulford,	Trin.	Hodgson,	Corpus	Dewing,	Tr.	*Miles,	Caius
Turner,	Caius	Otter,	Pemb.	*Hervey,	Ld. A. § Tr.	Bull,	Corp.
Townsend,	Trin.	Lewis,	Trin.	Goodall,	Cath.	Scott, G.	Trin.
Johnson,	Down.	Preedy,	Joh.	*Wise,	Joh.	Shapland,	Trin.
Wilson, jun.	Qu.	Reed,	Jesus	Kirkpatrick,	Trin.	Fell,	Joh.
*Rawes,	Caius	Heale,	Chr.	*Smithson,	Chr.	*Mills,	Job.
Law,	Qu.	Ray,	Emm.	Hayton,	Joh.	Dodson,	Job.
Bennett,	Corpus	Capron,	Joh.	Fairles,	Joh.	Morley,	Caius
Earle,	Clare	Money,	Corpus	Reynardson,	Trin.	Johnson,	Magd.
*Haddo, Ld.	Trin.						

* * * * *

Peacock,	Corpus	Senior,	Emm.	Tatham,	Joh.	Warren,	Jesus
Powys,	Chr.	Slyman,	Qu.	Walker,	Magd.	Wylde,	Magd.
Scott, G. S.	Trin.						

EGROTAT.]

Birch,	Pemb.	Freeman,	Caius	Garfit,	Trin.	*Jukes,	Corp.
--------	-------	----------	-------	---------	-------	---------	-------

COMBINATION PAPER, 1837.

PRIOR COMB.

Jan.	1. Mr. Kerrison, Corp. 8. Mr. G. Bland, Cai. 15. Coll. Regal. 22. Coll. Trin. 29. Coll. Joh.	Apr. 25. <i>Fest. S. Marc.</i> Mr. Haden, Corp. 30. Mr. Hankinson, Corp.
Feb.	5. Mr. Smith, Magd. 12. Mr. Parkin, Regin. 19. Mr. Haden, Corp. 26. Mr. Morgan, Cai.	Mai. 1. <i>Fest. SS. Phil. et Jac.</i> Mr. Raine, Trin.
Mar.	5. Coll. Regal. 12. Coll. Trin. 19. Coll. Joh. 26. <i>Fest. Pasch.</i>	4. <i>Fest. Ascen.</i> Mr. J. W. Barnes, Trin.
Apr.	2. Mr. Phillips, Regin. 9. Mr. Hankinson, Corp. 16. Mr. Tuck, Emm. 23. Coll. Regal. 30. Coll. Trin.	7. Mr. J. P. Lee, Trin. 14. <i>Fest. Pentec.</i> Mr. Hodgson, Magd.
Mai.	7. Coll. Joh. 14. <i>Fest. Pentec.</i> 21. Mr. Scott, Regin. 28. Mr. Shore, Sid.	15. Fer. Ima. Mr. C. Perry, Trin. 16. Fer. 2da. Mr. Brydges, Trin. 21. Mr. Wallace, Trin. 28. Mr. R. Chatfield, Trin.
Jun.	4. Mr. Dickson, Emm. 11. Coll. Regal. 18. Coll. Trin. 25. Coll. Joh.	Jun. 4. Mr. Mickleburgh, Trin. 11. <i>Fest. S. Barnab.</i> Mr. F. Parker, Trin.
Jul.	2. <i>Commem. Benefact.</i> 9. Mr. Dayrell, Magd. 16. Mr. Capper, Regin. 23. Mr. Coulcher, Corp. 30. Mr. Collin, Emm.	18. Mr. Salkeld, Trin. 24. <i>Fest. S. Joh. Bap.</i> Mr. J. G. Coddington, Trin. 25. Mr. Peile, Trin. 29. <i>Fes. S. Pet.</i> Mr. Ilderton, Trin.

Jul.	2. <i>Commem. Benefact.</i> 9. Mr. Ashworth, Trin. 16. Mr. Povah, Trin. 23. Mr. Hartopp, Trin. 25. <i>Fest. S. Jac.</i> Mr. H. S. Mar- riott, Trin. 30. Mr. W. Webster, Trin.	—
------	---	---

Resp. in Theolog. Oppon.

Jan.	1. <i>Fest. Circ.</i> Mr. J. Wilson, Cath. 6. <i>Fest. Eliph.</i> Mr. Wright, Cath. 8. Mr. Gilderdale, Cath. 15. Mr. I. Mandell, Cath. 22. Mr. Frobisher, Trin. 25. <i>Conver. S. Paul.</i> Mr. Griffiths, Regin. 29. Mr. Flamank, Regal.	Mr. Greaves, Emm. { Mr. Crosland, Mag. Mr. Fry, Regin. Mr. Skinner, Sid.
Feb.	2. <i>Fest. Purif.</i> Mr. Le Mann, Regal. 5. Mr. Russell, Pet. 8. <i>Dies Cinerum. Concia ad Clerum.</i> 12. Mr. Potter, Pet. 19. Mr. Scott, Pet. 24. <i>Fest. S. Matt.</i> Mr. Lowry, Clar. 28. Mr. Haymes, Clar.	Mr. Hodgson, Corp. { Mr. Brook, Cai. Coll. Regal. Coll. Trin. Coll. Joh. Mr. Beynon, Mag. { Mr. Hall, Mag. Mr. Pickford, Regin. Mr. Bastard, Joh. { Mr. Barne, Sid. Mr. Maude, Cai. (Coll. Regal. Mr. Greenall, Chr. { Coll. Trin. Coll. Joh. Mr. Brooks, Trin. { Mr. Ford, Mag. Mr. Atkinson, jun. { Regin. Mr. Tooth, Trin. { Mr. Bonney, Clar. Coll. Regal. Mr. Gilbert, Emm. { Mr. Adnutt, Emm. Coll. Joh. —
Mar.	5. Mr. Tremenhore, Pemb. 12. Mr. Smith, Cai. 19. Mr. G. Bland, Cai. 24. <i>Passio Domini.</i> Mr. Morgan, Cai. 25. <i>Fest. Annunc.</i> Mr. Page, Corp. 26. <i>Fest. Pasch.</i> Mr. Owen, Magd. 27. Fer. Ima. Mr. Goodwin, Corp. 28. Fer. 2da. Mr. Dodd, Corp.	Mr. Ireland, Emm. { Mr. Creaswell, Emm. Mr. Rushbrook, Tri. { Oppon. —
Apr.	2. Mr. Jones, Corp. 9. Mr. Wrench, Corp. 16. Mr. Thornton, Corp. 23. Mr. Kerrison, Corp.	Mr. Whitworth, Jes. { Mr. Farre, Cai. —

Resp. in Jur. Civ. Oppon.

Mr. Rushbrook, Tri.	{ Mr. Ireland, Emm. Mr. Creaswell, Emm.
Mr. Marsh, Cai.	{ Mr. Whitworth, Jes. Mr. Farre, Cai.

Resp. in Medic. Oppon.

MARRIAGES.

At Attenborough, the Rev. Samuel Fox, M.A. of Pembroke College, Oxford, and of Morley, Derbyshire, to Caroline Emma, only daughter of the late Wm. Charlton, Esq. of Chilwell Hall, in the county of Notts.

At Badminton, by the Rev. Lord Wm. Somerset, uncle to the bride, C. W. Codrington, Esq. M.P. for the Eastern Division of Gloucestershire, and formerly Gentleman Commoner of Christ Church, to the Lady Georgiana Somerset, second daughter of his Grace the Duke of Beaufort. His Grace the Duke of Wellington was present at the ceremony. After the marriage was solemnized, Mr. Codrington and his bride started for the seat of his brother-in-law, Sir Henry Peyton, Bart. where they will pass the honeymoon.

At Gumley, Leicestershire, by the Rev. R. Pretyman, M.A. Precentor of Lincoln, the Rev. John Fereday, B. A. Fellow of Worcester College, eldest son of J. T. Fereday, Esq. of the Ellowes, Staffordshire, to Susan, eldest daughter of the Rev. F. Apthorp, M.A. Rector of Gumley, and Prebendary of Lincoln.

At St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London, by the Ven. Archdeacon of London, the Rev. Frederick Wickham, M. A. Fellow of New College, to Louisa Margaret, eldest daughter of the Rev. Edw. Chaplin, M.A. of Gray's Inn, London.

At Holywell church, Oxford, by the Rev. W. W. Champneys, M.A. Fellow of Brasenose College, the Rev. Charles Stroud Green, M.A. of Christ Church, and one of the Masters of Leicester Collegiate School, to Amelia, eldest daughter of the late Mr. Thomas Brazier, of St. Martin's, Oxford.

At Bicester, by the Rev. J. Phelps, the Rev. Richard Walker, Chaplain of New College, to Eliza, youngest daughter of the late M. Rich. Maynard, of Weston-on-the-Green.

At Ashprington, Devon, the Rev. Henry Sanders, M.A. Student of Christ Church, and Head Master of Blundell's School, Tiverton, to Caroline Margaret Isabella, eldest daughter of the Rev. J. Ley, Rector of Ashprington.

At Trinity church, Brompton, the Rev. Oswald Joseph Cresswell, M. A. late

Fellow of Corpus Christi College, and Vicar of Seaham, Durham, to Anna Maria, eldest daughter of the Rev. Thos. Linwood Strong, B. D. of Oriel College, Rector of Sedgfield, Durham.

The Rev. Thomas Fordham Green, Rector of Graveley, Herts, to Julia Kortwright, third daughter of the late Rev. Philip Godfrey, Rector of Ayott St. Lawrence, Herts.

At Chichester, the Rev. William Potter, M. A. Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, Rector of Withersham, Suffolk, to Harriet, daughter of W. C. Newland, Esq. of Chichester, and niece of the late Sir George Murray.

The Rev. Alexander Henry Fownes Luttrell, of Pembroke College, Cambridge, Vicar of Minehead, Somersetshire, to Charlotte Anne, youngest daughter of the late Rev. J. Jeremy, Vicar of Moorlinch, Somersetshire.

The Rev. Alleyne Barker, Rector of Wouldham, to Mary Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the Rev. T. H. Gale, Vicar of Milton, Wilts.

At St. George's, Bloomsbury, the Rev. J. B. Owen, Incumbent of St. Mary's, Bilton, to Louisa, youngest daughter of J. W. Higgins, Esq. of Droxford, Herts.

BIRTHS.

At Leyton, Essex, the lady of the Rev. J. C. Leprimaudaye, of a son.

At the Vicarage, West Tarring, Sussex, the lady of the Rev. John Wood Warter, M. A. of Christ Church, of a daughter.

At Portland-place, London, the lady of the Rev. R. Seymour, of a daughter.

At Hatfield, the lady of the Rev. B. Peile, of a daughter.

At Witchampton Rectory, Dorset, the lady of the Rev. Carr John Glyn, M. A. late Student of Christ Church, of a son.

At the Vicarage, Kilmersdon, Somersetshire, the lady of the Rev. A. Phillips, of a son.

At the Vicarage, Tottenham, the lady of the Rev. Edward Vaux, of a daughter.

The lady of the Rev. J. W. Whitside, Rector of Ripon, Yorkshire, of a daughter.

At the Vicarage House, Brace Meole, Salop, the lady of the Rev. Laurence Otley, of a daughter.

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We will endeavour to enlighten "An old Cantab."

"X. Y." is too ludicrous for the "Remembrancer."

The object of "Amicus" is most praiseworthy, and shall receive from us every encouragement. It has afforded us pleasure in having the opportunity of meeting the wishes of "S. F." we shall be happy in receiving the communications to which he refers.

Our other Correspondents shall not be forgotten.